DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 001 IR 050 870

AUTHOR Byrd, Robert; And Others
TITLE Duke University: William R. Perkins Library Collection Analysis Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Duke Univ., Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 106p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Libraries; Higher Education; *Library Acquisition; *Library Collections; *Library Expenditures; *Library Materials; Library Personnel; *Library Planning; Library Research; Library Role; Library Services; Research Libraries; Self Evaluation (Groups); Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Duke University NC

ABSTRACT

To enable the William R. Perkins Library to focus attention on its collection development operation, a six-member study committee was appointed to review within the present and future environment of the university current collection development policies and procedures and to suggest changes as appropriate to ensure effective use of the library's and the university's resources. The committee first studied the history of collection development in the libraries and the environment in which collection development activities occur. The interim report included here presents the committee's findings in the following areas: environmental analysis (including university goals, research and instructional programs, fiscal factors, and publishing industry trends); history and description of the library collections (including developers of the collection, cooperation, and perceptions of collection strengths); and current collection development operating practices (including funding, staff positions and responsibilities, and objectives and goals). In the next phase, 14 staff members were assigned to 4 task forces charged with examining the allocation of materials funds, assessments of the library's collections, the development of collection policies, and organization and staffing for collection development activities. The reports of the task forces are included here. The study committee assessed and synthesized the recommendations of the task forces into 19 final recommendations which are presented in this final report. (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED250001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DUKE UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM R. PERKINS LIBRARY

COLLECTION ANALYSIS PROJECT

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by the CAP Study Committee:
Robert Byrd, Chair
Virginia Gilbert
Katherine Porter
Helen Reed
Jeri Van Goethem
Jane Vogel

Durham, North Carolina

August 1984

IR050870

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Maxine Sitts
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents

Preface....................i

Introduction....................iii

Recommendations of the Study Committee....................1

Interim Report....................13

  Environmental Analysis....................17

  History and Description of the Library Collections....................30

  Current Collection Development Operating Practices....................39

  Charges to the Task Forces....................47

Report of the Task Force on Organization and Staffing....................90

Report of the Task Force on the Allocation of Materials Funds....................134

Report of the Task Force on Assessment....................174

Report of the Task Force on Collection Policies....................242

Page numbers in this table of contents refer to large numerals in the upper right corner of pages in the report. This pagination provides a single sequence for the full final report. The original internal pagination (centered at top or bottom of pages) has been retained for the Interim Report and the reports of the task forces so that internal references to page numbers are intelligible.

Preface

Much of a major academic research library's supportive effort is directed towards the building of collections to serve the parent institution's research and instructional needs. To that end, a large proportion of staff time is spent in efforts involving activities which frequently transcend the borders of various units within the library. Support of the collection development endeavor is a complicated and costly operation. In recognition of this fact, a number of libraries have accepted the need for established collection development policies and guidelines derived from a systematic study of the total operation. Through its Office of Management Studies (OMS), the Association of Research Libraries has been instrumental in attracting attention to this need. OMS developed procedures for conducting self-studies of collection development operations in research libraries. In addition, OMS has provided staff to give advice and assist with the conducting of these studies. This assistance has been invaluable, and when the Perkins Library focused its attention upon such an undertaking OMS staff played a major role, enabling us to proceed with our own Collection Analysis Project.

As suggested above, a major collection development operation involves many members of the staff and many separate operations requiring constant cooperation. Moreover, it is dependent upon faculty support and participation. University administrative support also is essential, particularly so through adequate funding to maintain a viable collection development program.

To enable the Library to focus attention upon its collection development operation, the Collection Analysis Project Study Committee was appointed in October, 1983, and asked to review within the present and future environment of the University current collection development policies and procedures and to recommend changes as appropriate to ensure effective use of the Library's and the University's resources. The Committee, and its four task forces, subsequently appointed in February, 1984, to study specific areas of collection development operations, have compiled detailed and insightful reports and recommendations. A great deal of information not heretofore available has been pulled together which will provide directions for improvement and establish goals toward which we must strive.

In an effort to attain these goals, recommendations of the Committee will serve to point the way. Steps to comply with these recommendations will need to be taken as rapidly as possible. Priorities will need to be established in dealing with the recommendations, i.e., priorities in terms of which recommendations are to receive attention first and priorities in terms of which can be dealt with realistically in light of circumstances which may face us at any given moment.

Our intention is to study the recommendations to ascertain priorities and feasibility, the means by which implementation can be undertaken, and the extent to which recommendations can be followed. The Assistant University Librarians will study the overall final report and supporting documents with particular attention directed to recommendations which have impact upon their areas of responsibility and those which involve a greater degree of cooperation between their units than may heretofore have been the case.

From this study, on an individual basis and as a team, the Assistant University Librarians will work with the University Librarian and other appropriate staff to set forth a plan of implementation in priority order for consideration by staff, by the Library Council, and by the University Administration.

Present and ongoing commitments, other projects affecting the Library's level of service, staffing patterns, and funding will dictate to varying degrees the order of selection of recommendations with which to proceed. Some recommendations may be implemented with relatively little effort. Others will require longer study and perhaps modification in light of other changes taking place. Additional committee work may be in order and this will have to be undertaken with a view to balance and to demands imposed upon staff and budgetary resources.

Basically, however, we must recognize the need to move forward with review and implementation of the recommendations. To do so as rapidly as possible will benefit the Library and the University community which it serves. As stated in the Committee report implementation of the recommendations is "intended to create a structure, and establish procedures that will facilitate selection of library materials, formulation of written collection policies, systematic assessment of the collections, and adequate documentation of budgetary needs and expenditures." It is up to all of us to strive to achieve these benefits to be derived from a common effort.

It is obvious a particular debt of gratitude is owed the members of the Collection Analysis Project Study Committee and to members of the four task forces. Their work reflects the high standards and dedication to the Library which we have learned to expect and for which all of us and the University community must be grateful. The attention which so many of the staff have directed to the work of the Committee and task forces is indicative of our appreciation and of the high hopes with which we proceed.

Elvin Strowd
University Librarian
August 20, 1984

Introduction

A Collection Analysis Project is a self-study of collection development procedures and policies undertaken by an academic library with assistance from the Office of Management Studies of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). A study committee to conduct a Collection Analysis Project at Duke University was appointed by University Librarian Elvin Strowd in October 1983. The basic purpose of the project, as stated by Mr. Strowd in his charge to the committee, was "to review within the present and future environment of the University current collection development policies and procedures and to recommend changes as appropriate to ensure efficient and effective use of the Library's and the University's resources." The committee was instructed to investigate organization and staffing of collection development operations, the allocation of materials funds, and the development of collection policies.

Following the ARL guidelines, the committee first studied the history of collection development in the Duke University Libraries and the environment in which collection development activities occur. It documented its findings in an interim report issued in March 1984. In the next phase of the project four task forces charged by the study committee examined the allocation of materials funds, assessments of the library's collections, the development of collection policies, and organization and staffing for collection development activities. The task forces submitted written reports to the study committee in June 1984. The study committee assessed and synthesized the recommendations of the task forces to develop the final recommendations of the project. Most of the actions suggested by the task forces were included in the recommendations of the study committee; those omitted were considered unnecessary in light of other recommendations. In addition to the recommendations of the study committee, the full final report of the committee includes the interim report and the reports of the task forces. An abbreviated version consisting only of the University Librarian's preface, this introduction, and the committee's final recommendations is also being prepared.

Besides the fourteen staff members who joined members of the study committee to form the four task forces, numerous other library staff, faculty, and administrators have contributed to the completion of the Collection Analysis Project. Members of the study committee met with Provost Phillip Griffiths, Deans Ernestine Friedl and Craufurd Goodwin, Mr. Richard Stubbing, and Professor Arie Lewin to discuss university concerns relating to collection development. Surveys were sent to faculty and to library staff. The interim report and the task force reports were shared with members of the Library Council Executive Committee, and the study committee met twice with the Executive Committee to discuss the progress of the project and the recommendations to be made by the committee. The interim report and the task force reports were distributed also to the library staff, and a number of staff members have responded to them with helpful suggestions and comments.

It should be noted that the study committee and its task forces have been concerned primarily with operations and policies of the Perkins

Library system. Headed by the University Librarian, who reports to the office of the Provost, the Perkins system includes, besides Perkins Library itself, nine branch libraries: Biology/Forestry, Chemistry, Divinity School, East Campus, Engineering, Marine Laboratory, Math/Physics, Music, and Undergraduate. The Fuqua School of Business Library, the Law School Library, and the Medical Center Library are separately administered and funded libraries and have been mentioned in this report only as they relate to collection development in Perkins. Within the Perkins system, and in the context of this report, the term "science libraries" is normally meant to include the Engineering Library as well as the Biology/Forestry, Chemistry and Math/Physics libraries even though the Engineering Library serves primarily the School of Engineering rather than the Arts and Sciences.

It should be noted also that the study committee has not addressed all issues of importance for collection development. Preservation of library materials, for example, is a topic on which the ARL guidelines suggest a separate task force, but the Collection Analysis Project at Duke was not intended to include that aspect of the project. The Task Force on Organization and Staffing did note, however, that mechanisms for handling materials in need of preservation on a current basis must be established, and the study committee urges the library and university administration to address this need.

In submitting its recommendations to the University Librarian, the study committee hopes that they will be reviewed, approved, and implemented. The committee has sought to be specific in its recommendations both with regard to the persons responsible for carrying them out and with regard to the timing of critical aspects of implementation. The major recommendations are presented first in the report and are all interdependent. The degree to which they can be implemented will depend in large part upon the appointment of a second General Bibliographer to the Collection Development Office, as explained in recommendation number six. Until that appointment is made, implementation of the other recommendations will necessarily be gradual and incomplete. Members of the committee realize that the change in library administration at the end of 1984 may also cause some delay in implementation, but we believe that the present University Librarian can set in place this fall the basic structures recommended in the report, and we hope that the new University Librarian will review the full report and proceed with implementation of its recommendations. We would urge the university administration to make the full report available to candidates interviewed for the position of University Librarian.

Basically the recommendations of the study committee are intended to create a structure and establish procedures that will facilitate selection of library materials, formulation of written collection policies, systematic assessment of the collections, and adequate documentation of budgetary needs and expenditures. We believe that the library and the campus community can and must accomplish these fundamental tasks. Primary responsibility for them lies with the Collection Development Office, but they can be accomplished only through a cooperative effort involving the entire library staff, the faculty, the university administration, and other segments of the campus community.

Recommendations of the Study Committee

1. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT RESPONSIBILITIES BE ASSIGNED BY ACADEMIC SUBJECTS TO LIBRARIANS THROUGHOUT THE PERKINS SYSTEM, PRINCIPALLY IN PUBLIC SERVICE DEPARTMENTS AND BRANCH LIBRARIES, SO THAT FOR ALL MAJOR DISCIPLINES THERE ARE SUBJECT AREA LIBRARIANS INVOLVED IN SELECTION, FACULTY LIAISON, POLICY DEVELOPMENT, COLLECTION ASSESSMENT, AND ALLOCATION.

Organizing collection development activities by academic subject will facilitate building and managing the library's collections in harmony with the university's research and instructional mission. It will encourage faculty participation in collection development while promoting balanced and consistent growth and management of the collections. It will facilitate communication with the university administration about academic priorities and library resources. As contrasted with developing a corps of bibliographers within the Collection Development Office to handle all collection development functions, distribution of these functions among existing staff in public service areas has the advantage of encouraging selection of materials in the context of familiarity with the needs and interests of library users. This distribution of collection development responsibilities by subject area was recommended also by the External Review Committee for the Duke University Library in its report of May 9, 1983, to Chancellor H. Keith H. Brodie.

Many public service and branch librarians already participate in collection development activities. In the science libraries and the other subject-based branch libraries areas of responsibility are well defined and will fit readily into the structure proposed here. In the social sciences and humanities, however, subject area responsibilities need to be equitably distributed and formally assigned. Job descriptions should include a commitment to collection development functions and collection development work should be formally evaluated by a staff member in the Collection Development Office.

To implement this recommendation the Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development in consultation with the Assistant University Librarian for Public Services should identify librarians to whom specific subject areas can appropriately be assigned. It may be desirable for the Assistant University Librarian for Public Services first to distribute a questionnaire to public service librarians to determine which ones are interested in assuming formal collection development responsibilities for which subjects. The subject areas for which assignments need to be made include classical studies, English and American languages and literatures, philosophy, geology, anthropology, economics, history, political science, psychology, public policy studies, and sociology. It may be feasible to proceed immediately with only a few of these assignments, making others as appropriate staff are available and librarians in the Collection Development Office are able to undertake the necessary training and coordination. In any case, the assignments should be made by the University Librarian with the initial ones occurring in October 1984. The Personnel Librarian should work with the subject area librarians to see that their job descriptions incorporate their collection development responsibilities.

2. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE SUBJECT AREA LIBRARIANS IN CONSULTATION WITH APPROPRIATE FACULTY AND COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OFFICE PERSONNEL WRITE COLLECTION POLICY STATEMENTS FOR THEIR SUBJECTS UTILIZING THE MODEL DESCRIBED IN THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON COLLECTION POLICIES.

A written policy will permit more effective use of resources, both human and material, in the continuing development of the Duke University Library collection. It will promote balance and consistency in the growth of the collection by documenting the collection's dimensions. It will facilitate assignment of collecting responsibilities among various library units as well as consistency in collecting practices during changes in staff. A written policy will describe the library's intentions and commitments with respect to building the collection and thus serve to aid communication both with library users and with potential partners in cooperative collection development agreements. It will assist in determining and documenting budgetary needs.

A written policy that consists of a set of policy statements, each following the same format, for all the major subject areas in which the library acquires materials will best serve the purposes stated above. The subject categories listed in the report of the Task Force on Collection Policies should be used by the Collection Development Office as a guideline for determining the areas in which statements need to be written. The categories used for policies should correspond to those used for allocation of the materials budget and for assignment of collection development responsibilities. As the task force report recommends, statements should be written for interdisciplinary formats and collections--the audiovisual collection, East Campus Library, manuscripts, newspapers, public documents, rare books, and the reference collection--as well as for subject areas. Each statement should include the following standard elements: purpose, coordinative and cooperative information (for Perkins system, Duke University, Research Triangle, and other areas), strengths and weaknesses of the existing collection, collection guidelines (geographical guidelines, chronological guidelines, languages, date of publication, types of material), related policy statements, and collection levels by subject subdivision (level of existing collection, level of current collecting activity, level appropriate for meeting program needs). The definitions and symbols to be used in describing collection levels are specified in the task force report, which provides further instructions and guidelines for writing policy statements in the recommended format.

The Collection Development Office should coordinate the writing of the statements by the subject area librarians, ensure that appropriate faculty consultation occurs, review the completed statements, and arrange for faculty review as recommended in the task force report. When statements have been written for all the assigned areas, the Collection Development Office should prepare an introduction and an index for the statements and submit the document to the University Librarian and the Library Council for review and approval. The statements should be revised on a regular schedule as outlined in the task force report.

3. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE SUBJECT AREA LIBRARIANS UNDERTAKE SYSTEMATIC ASSESSMENTS OF THE LIBRARY'S COLLECTIONS IN THE SUBJECT AREAS ASSIGNED TO THEM, AS TIME ALLOWS. PRIORITY SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE AREAS IDENTIFIED IN THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON ASSESSMENT, AND ALL RELEVANT VERIFICATION STUDIES PREPARED BY THE RESEARCH LIBRARIES GROUP SHOULD BE UTILIZED AS THEY BECOME AVAILABLE. SPECIFIC FUNDS, POSSIBLY INCOME FROM UNRESTRICTED ENDOWMENTS, SHOULD BE USED FOR RETROSPECTIVE PURCHASING TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES IN THE COLLECTIONS.

Systematic assessments of the library's collections on a periodic basis are crucial for ensuring that collection development efforts have achieved their intended results. Assessments are also valuable in helping the library respond to changing programs and newly developing research interests. The information obtained through an assessment must be carefully analyzed to determine whether the shape of the collection, what it includes and what it lacks, is appropriate to the research and instructional mission of the university. Where undesirable deficiencies are noted, the Collection Development Office should make funds, possibly drawn from unrestricted endowment income, available for retrospective purchasing and should reevaluate the current allocation to the subject.

The Task Force on Assessment found that conducting a systematic evaluation of the library's holdings in a field was an excellent way for a librarian to become more knowledgeable about the collection and the subject. Subject area librarians should design and conduct assessments in consultation with faculty interested in the subject. Academic departments should be encouraged to provide student assistants to help carry out assessments in subjects of interest to the department.

4. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OFFICE ALLOCATE THE MATERIALS BUDGET BY SUBJECT AND THAT THE SUBJECT LIBRARIANS MONITOR EXPENDITURES FOR THEIR SUBJECTS AND PREPARE BUDGET REQUESTS, UTILIZING THE FORM RECOMMENDED BY THE TASK FORCE ON ALLOCATION.

For effective use of the materials budget in acquiring library materials to support the university's research and instructional programs, the budget both for monographs and for serials should be allocated by subject. There should be allocations also for interdisciplinary formats and collections such as public documents and reference materials. As stated earlier, the subject categories used for allocation should correspond with those used for policy statements and assignment of collection development responsibilities. The subject allocations should be based on a number of factors: the institution's academic profile, collection use, characteristics of the collection, publishing factors, and local price indexes. Specific categories of information needed in these various areas are identified in the budget request form developed by the Task Force on Allocation. Data in some of the categories can best be obtained by the Collection Development Office from central sources such as the Registrar's Office. Other information can best be supplied to the Collection Development Office by subject area librarians who maintain frequent contact with faculty in their areas concerning research and teaching needs and collection development activities. No single element among the factors covered in the budget request form should be considered the primary determining element in allocations. Rather all the factors should be considered together and weighted with judgment by the Collection Development Office.

Subject area librarians should prepare budget request forms annually in August beginning in 1985, submitting them to the Collection Development Office by September 1. They should monitor expenditures in their subject areas on a regular basis, using information supplied by the Collection Development Office and the library's Systems Office.

5. **THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE ASSISTANT UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN FOR COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT AND THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN USE THE BUDGET REQUESTS FROM THE SUBJECT AREA LIBRARIANS TO PREPARE A FORMAL MATERIALS BUDGET REQUEST FOR PRESENTATION TO THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION. THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN SHOULD ALSO PREPARE AND DISTRIBUTE TO THE FACULTY AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY AN ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE LIBRARY THAT DOCUMENTS LIBRARY NEEDS AND EXPENDITURES.**

The appropriation of an adequate materials budget for the library can best be achieved through a non-adversarial, working partnership between the university's faculty/administration and the library. There should be a genuine understanding on the part of the university of the library's mission in higher education, and there should be true commitment on the part of the library to exercise every economy and to spend funds wisely in close support of the university's teaching and research mission. There must be a reliable, back-and-forth flow of communication and consultation between the library and the university community.

In the past the only information supplied to the university administration prior to appropriation of the materials budget has been a projected inflation figure. A more vigorous and thorough case for the library's budget needs should be made. At many other universities an annual library budget request that documents and justifies the amount requested is submitted to the administration. The budget request forms from the subject area librarians will provide the information from which such a document can be prepared by the Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development and the University Librarian annually in September and October, beginning in 1985. The University Librarian can then consult with the Library Council and present this formal materials budget request to the university administration in time for the information to be used in decisions regarding the materials budget.

The institution of an annual report on the state of the library presented to the campus community at large would likewise increase understanding of the library and its budgetary needs. The study committee recommends that the University Librarian prepare and distribute such a report annually in September, beginning in 1985.

6. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT A SECOND GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHER BE APPOINTED TO THE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OFFICE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AND THAT THE TWO GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHERS BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBJECT AREA LIBRARIANS, ONE WORKING PRIMARILY WITH THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE OTHER PRIMARILY WITH THE HUMANITIES.

If the subject area librarians are to carry out the collection development functions recommended previously in this report, they must receive training, and their activities must be supervised and coordinated. The General Bibliographers should train the subject area librarians and coordinate their work with respect to selection; policy writing; assessments; decision-making (retention, location, etc.) for gifts, exchanges, standing order press titles, monographic series, duplicates, etc.; faculty liaison; budget monitoring;and approval plans. They should also have collection development responsibilities for subject areas not assigned to subject area librarians. Additional duties are specified in Appendix J of the report of the Task Force on Organization and Staffing.

As pointed out in the introduction to this report, the timing of the appointment of a second General Bibliographer will affect the speed with which many of the other recommendations can be carried out as well as their feasibility. It seems unlikely that the position can be established and filled before mid-1985. Until the appointment is made, the present General Bibliographer should initiate work with subject area librarians to the degree possible. The study committee recommends that this work begin with subject area librarians in the social sciences and that the new General Bibliographer be given responsibility for the humanities. Once this structure is functioning some realignment of subject area responsibilities between the General Bibliographers may be desirable depending upon how many subject areas and subject area librarians each General Bibliographer is handling. The General Bibliographer for the social sciences should be responsible also for collection development functions with respect to science materials acquired for Perkins Library and for coordination of collection development activities with the engineering and science librarians. It may be desirable in addition to have one of the science librarians serve as an adviser and advocate to the Collection Development Office on behalf of the science libraries. The General Bibliographer for the humanities should be responsible also for coordination of the collection development activities of librarians handling the interdisciplinary formats and collections mentioned previously (audiovisual collection, East Campus Library, manuscripts, etc.).

Staffing levels and reporting relationships within the Collection Development Office should be reexamined in 1986 or 1987. The addition of full-time staff to the office, the changing role and responsibilities of staff within the office, and the appointment of subject area librarians and Technical Services/Collection Development liaisons will significantly alter collection development operations in the next one to two years. Some realignment of reporting relationships and staff responsibilities may be desirable after these changes have occurred. The Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development should be responsible for initiating appropriate reassessment.

7. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE ASSISTANT UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN FOR TECHNICAL SERVICES IN CONSULTATION WITH TECHNICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT HEADS AND THE ASSISTANT UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN FOR COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT APPOINT A COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT LIAISON IN EACH OF THE TECHNICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENTS--ACQUISITIONS, CATALOGING, AND SERIALS. THE DEPUTY COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OFFICER SHOULD SERVE AS A CORRESPONDING LIAISON FROM COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT TO TECHNICAL SERVICES.

If collection development activities are to be efficiently handled and staff time shifted from item-by-item management decisions to more substantive policy decisions, procedures and workflows involving interaction between Collection Development and Technical Services departments must be reviewed and improved. The committee views the appointment of liaisons as the most efficient and effective way of conducting such review and thus as crucial to the successful implementation of other recommendations in this report. The liaisons should work with other staff in their respective departments to revise and document procedures as appropriate to expedite the flow of materials and information. Specific concerns to be addressed by the liaisons are identified in Appendix I of the report of the Task Force on Organization and Staffing. Another matter requiring attention from the liaisons in Acquisitions and Collection Development is review of procedures for processing orders from catalogs of out-of-print materials. Priorities for addressing these various concerns and any others that arise should be established by the liaisons. The Personnel Librarian should work with the individuals involved to clarify the roles of the liaisons and to make appropriate changes in their job descriptions.

Since many of the collection development activities involving support from the Serials Department depend upon the work of the Processing and Records units of that department, it would be desirable in the long-term for the liaison responsibility and a reporting relationship from those two units to be vested in the same position. However, this need not be the case immediately. Proceeding with appointment of the liaisons in September or October 1984 is essential if other recommendations in this report are to be carried out.

The liaisons should not be a substitute for communication between the Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development and the Technical Services department heads. Furthermore, in assessing problems and developing solutions, the liaisons should work in consultation with their department heads and other staff in their respective departments.

The Deputy Collection Development Officer should serve also as a Collection Development Office liaison with Public Services and Library

Systems. Additional duties of this position are described in Appendix J of the report of the Task Force on Organization and Staffing.

8. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OFFICE WORK WITH LIBRARY SYSTEMS TO OBTAIN MAXIMUM BENEFIT FOR COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES FROM AUTOMATED SYSTEMS PRESENTLY AVAILABLE AND THAT THE LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION PROCEED WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM.

Since the task force reports were submitted to the study committee, the Collection Development staff has implemented a system for inputting data into the Technical Services Data Base that will allow for more thorough analysis of library acquisitions and materials expenditures by subject. These efforts should continue as staffing levels permit. Arrangements should be made with the Systems Office to generate regular reports regarding expenditures by fund and subject, numbers of titles purchased, average prices by subject, branch library fund balances, etc. As indicated previously, the Deputy Collection Development Officer should have primary responsibility for working with Library Systems on these matters.

No amount of enhancement of current systems can substitute for a fully integrated automated system supplying bibliographic and circulation data needed for collection development activities. The study committee urges the library administration to implement such a system.

9. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE FACULTY LIBRARY REPRESENTATIVE STRUCTURE BE CONTINUED, THAT RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE LIBRARY REPRESENTATIVES BE CLARIFIED, AND THAT THE ASSIGNMENT OF SUBJECT AREA RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN THE LIBRARY BE UTILIZED TO IMPROVE COMMUNICATION AND STRENGTHEN TIES BETWEEN FACULTY AND LIBRARY STAFF INVOLVED IN COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT.

As suggested previously in this report, faculty involvement is essential in writing collection policies, assessing collections, and selecting library materials. The subject area librarians should work closely in all their activities with faculty from their assigned areas. The Deputy Collection Development Officer should develop a manual for the faculty that documents library procedures with which they should be familiar and clarifies their role and that of the library representatives in the collection development process. The Collection Development Office should assume responsibility for ensuring that academic departments give adequate attention to developing the library's collections. When a library representative is less active than is desirable, the Assistant University Librarian should speak with the department chairman about appointing a more interested individual.

10. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE PRESENT PERIODICALS COMMITTEE BE RE-DEFINED AS A SERIALS/PERIODICALS STANDING ORDER COM-

MITTEE AND THAT THE SERIALS DEPARTMENT ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR GATHERING BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND MAINTAINING THE FILES RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE.

The Serials/Periodicals Standing Order Committee should review and approve recommendations for new serial and periodical subscriptions in all subject areas. Members of the committee should be appointed by the Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development and should be drawn from among the Collection Development Office staff and the subject area librarians with the latter appointees possibly serving two-year staggered terms and with ex-officio membership from Serials and Current Periodicals. Since the record-keeping that accompanies the committee's work parallels and overlaps the record-keeping functions of the Serials Department, the Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development should work with the head of the Serials Department to shift the information gathering and record-keeping to Serials. Serials should undertake the requesting of sample issues and subscription information and should maintain records concerning titles under consideration, on order, or rejected by the committee. Some of these records are already kept by the Serials Department. The records should be maintained in such a fashion that they can serve the information needs of the Public Service and Collection Development staff as well as preserve a record of the committee's work.

11. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE TASK OF BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR THE MATERIALS BUDGET BE MOVED FROM THE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OFFICE TO THE ACQUISITIONS DEPARTMENT AND THAT THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE TWO SUPPORT STAFF POSITIONS IN THE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OFFICE BE CLEARLY DEFINED.

The transfer of responsibility for budget resolution should be approved and initiated by the Assistant University Librarians for Collection Development, Technical Services, and Administrative Services. All staff affected by the transfer should be consulted before it takes place. Peripheral duties associated with the budget process, as described in the report of the Task Force on Organization and Staffing, should be defined and delegated either to Collection Development staff or to Acquisitions staff.

A list of duties to be carried out by the staff assistant and secretary in the Collection Development Office appears in Appendix J of the report of the Task Force on Organization and Staffing. The Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development and the Deputy Collection Development Officer should assign these duties to the appropriate position, provide necessary training, and document procedures to be used by the support staff.

12. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE PHYSICAL SPACE OCCUPIED BY THE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OFFICE BE EXPANDED AND REORGANIZED SO THAT MATERIALS CAN BE MORE EFFICIENTLY HANDLED AND THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF IS LOCATED AWAY FROM HEAVY TRAFFIC.

The present physical arrangement of desks and work areas in the Collection Development Office provides open access to the professional staff and allows constant interruption of their work without screening of routine concerns and questions. Adequate shelving and space for review of materials by Collection Development Office staff and subject area librarians must be provided either in the Collection Development Office or Technical Services areas.

Expansion of the office could be accomplished by the creation of a new office outside the present offices. The Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development in consultation with the Assistant University Librarian for Administrative Services should initiate an investigation of this and other options. In the meantime, work areas should be reorganized since the present arrangement hinders both the professional staff and the support staff in performance of their duties. The best interim solution may be to move the Technical Services Data Base terminal to the area outside Room 117, have desks for the two support staff positions in the outer office of 117, and create a work area for the professional staff in Room 118. The two basement offices should be retained as office areas for the professional staff.

13. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT A STUDY BE CONDUCTED TO DETERMINE WHETHER A CENTRALIZED SEARCHING STAFF IS DESIRABLE AND, IF IT IS, WHERE SUCH A UNIT WOULD BEST FIT INTO THE ORGANIZATION OF THE LIBRARY.

The Task Force on Organization and Staffing pointed out that there are substantial variations in the levels of staff training, oversight, and quality control provided by searching units in the three Technical Services departments. There is also some duplication of effort in searching done by Acquisitions, Serials, and pre-cataloging staff in the Cataloging Department. For these reasons, the feasibility of more centralized searching should be investigated.

A task force to conduct the study should be appointed by the Assistant University Librarians for Technical Services and Collection Development in consultation with department heads and should include representatives from Acquisitions, Cataloging, Serials, and Collection Development. Regardless of the outcome of the study, guidelines and procedures for the searching process should be developed, either by the task force or by the Technical Services and Collection Development liaisons. If centralized searching is instituted, the feasibility of centralized ordering should also be examined.

14. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE EXCHANGE PROGRAM BE STRENGTHENED BY THE DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES TO FOCUS THE PROGRAM ON MATERIALS NOT AVAILABLE THROUGH OTHER MECHANISMS; BY IMPROVEMENT IN CONSISTENCY OF RECORDS BETWEEN THE SERIALS AND EXCHANGE FILES; AND BY PROVISIONS FOR ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS IN THE APPROPRIATE ALLOCATIONS AS EXCHANGES ARE CANCELLED.

Exchange operations are costly in terms of staff time, and materials purchased for purposes of exchange are increasingly expensive. The Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development, in consultation with the head of Acquisitions and the head of the Gifts and Exchanges Unit, should develop guidelines that can be used during the annual review of exchanges to focus the exchange program on materials which are desirable under the library's collection policies but not readily available through other mechanisms. To expedite the exchange review process the head of Serials and the head of Acquisitions, in consultation with appropriate staff, should seek to improve communication concerning the serial records and the exchange files and to maintain consistency between them.

As exchanges are reviewed and titles shifted from exchange to purchase, corresponding adjustments should be made in the exchange and serial budget allocations. In their annual budget requests the subject area librarians should utilize information derived from the automated acquisition system to include in their requests subscription commitments for titles formerly received on exchange.

15. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REGARDING THE ACCEPTANCE AND PROCESSING OF GIFT MATERIALS FOR THE GENERAL COLLECTION BE MORE CLEARLY DEFINED.

If gifts-in-kind are to have a significant role in the development of the general collection, priorities and procedures must be established and documented to ensure that only appropriate gifts are accepted and that those accepted are efficiently integrated into Collection Development and Technical Services processes. The Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development should issue general guidelines for the types of gifts to be accepted and should take responsibility for overseeing the receipt and initial processing of gift materials. Collection Development must devise mechanisms for the routine screening of new gift collections and of collections previously received but not yet processed. This screening should be conducted by Collection Development Office staff or appropriate subject area librarians and should eliminate materials obviously inappropriate under current collection policies. The Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development should work with appropriate staff from Technical Services and Public Services to determine the level of searching and the extent of shelf-checking required for processing gift materials, the stage at which this should take place, and the staff who should carry out these procedures.

16. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT EFFORTS BE CONTINUED TO CENTRALIZE ACCESS TO THE SERIALS HOLDINGS OF THE DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES, INCLUDING THE HOLDINGS OF THE MEDICAL CENTER LIBRARY, THE PERKINS PUBLIC DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT, AND THE FUQUA SCHOOL OF BUSINESS LIBRARY.

The study committee enthusiastically supports current plans to produce a microfiche catalog of serials holdings in the Medical Center

Library and to merge that library's serials database with the Perkins' online file of serials. These steps will provide major benefits for both Public Services and Collection Development. The committee urges the heads of the Public Documents and Serials departments to establish an ongoing process for including on the Perkins' microfiche catalog document serials not now represented there. A method should be devised by the head of the Fuqua School of Business Library and the head of the Serials Department to include on the serials microfiche catalog some record of the approximately 300 periodicals received by the Fuqua Library but presently accessible only through an internal periodicals list.

17. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT ADDITIONAL EMPHASIS BE GIVEN TO COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL AND NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY.

The lack of collection policies and of a structured approach to collection development activities has impeded Duke's involvement in strengthening and extending cooperative collection development efforts. The implementation of recommendations regarding those matters should allow the Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development to dedicate more time to cooperative efforts. It will also facilitate direct communication between the General Bibliographers and subject area librarians and their counterparts at the other Triangle area research libraries.

18. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT MORE ATTENTION BE GIVEN TO POINTING OUT FOR USERS AND STAFF THE TYPES OF MATERIALS NOT REPRESENTED IN THE PUBLIC CATALOGS.

Most of the materials not entered in the public catalogs are accessible through other means--departmental catalogs in the Manuscript, Rare Book, and Public Documents departments or printed finding aids such as Selected Rand Abstracts and Statistical Reference Index. One way to call more attention to this fact would be to prepare a booklet describing the major access tools for materials that, in accordance with library policy, are not fully represented in the library's main catalogs because of format or source. The Library of Congress recently published a booklet, The Card Catalogs of the Library of Congress, that may serve as a model for such a project. The study committee urges the Reference Department to produce such a guide and to consider, along with other Public Services and Technical Services departments, additional means of communicating more effectively to library users and staff concerning the limitations of the public catalogs for locating certain materials held by the library.

19. THE STUDY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT A FORMAL REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTION ANALYSIS PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS BE SCHEDULED FOR JANUARY 1986.

Inevitably circumstances and needs change with time. A year from now some recommendations made by the study committee may seem more urgent and important than they do now while others may no longer appear appropriate. The University Librarian should appoint a formal Collection Analysis Project Review Committee, composed primarily or entirely of members of the study committee or task forces, in January 1986 to report on the extent to which project recommendations have been implemented and the degree to which further action or reassessment is required.

DUKE UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM R. PERKINS LIBRARY

COLLECTION ANALYSIS PROJECT

INTERIM REPORT

Prepared by the CAP Study Committee:
Robert Byrd, Chair
Virginia Gilbert
Katherine Porter
Helen Reed
Jeri Van Goethem
Jane Vogel

Durham, North Carolina

March, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Environmental Analysis 2

  University Goals 2

  Research and Instructional Programs 3

  Fiscal Factors. 7

  Trends in the Publishing Industry 10

History and Description of the Library Collections 15

  Developers of the Collections 16

  Cooperation 18

  Perceptions of Collection Strengths 21

Current Collection Development Operating Practices 24

  Funding 24

  Staff Positions and Responsibilities. 26

  Objectives and Goals. 28

Notes. 31

Charges to the Task Forces:

  Task Force on Allocation of Materials Funds 32

  Task Force on Assessment Procedures 33

  Task Force on Collection Policies 34

  Task Force on Organization and Staffing 35

Tables 36

Appendix A: Faculty Survey Letter and Form. 58

Appendix B: Summary of Responses to Faculty Survey. 61

LIST OF TABLES

1 ARL Rankings of Duke University Libraries by Volumes Held, Volumes Added, and Materials Expenditures

2 Enrollment

3 Departments and Degree Programs

4 Special Programs

5 Distribution of Undergraduates According to Major

6 Bachelors Degrees by Major

7 Distribution of Graduate Students According to Major

8 Graduate Degrees by Major

9 Number of Faculty

10 Number of Faculty by Departments

11 Faculty Assessment of Library Collection

12 Comparison of Total University Expenditures, Educational and General Expenditures, and Library Expenditures, 1977/78 - 1982/83

13 Annual Budget Appropriations of University Funds for Library Materials, 1970/71 - 1983/84

14 Perkins System Materials Expenditures (in dollars) According to Source of Funds

15 Materials Expenditures: Comparison of the Perkins System, Law, Medical and Fuqua Libraries

16 United States Hardbound Book Prices

17 United States Periodical Prices

18 Estimated Acquisitions by U.S. College and University Libraries of Books Published both Domestically and Abroad

19 A Comparison of Selected Perkins Library Average Materials Costs with United States Average Materials Prices

20 Growth of Collections by Library: Perkins System

21 Expenditures (in dollars) for Serials and Non-Serials: Perkins System

22 Book and Serial Expenditures by Library, 1980/81 - 1982/83

INTRODUCTION

The Collection Analysis Project Study Committee was appointed by University Librarian Elvin Strowd in October 1983 to investigate and make recommendations in the following areas: (1) organization and staffing in collection development operations; (2) the allocation of materials funds; and (3) the development of collection policies. As the committee has reviewed these concerns, it has concluded that procedures for collection assessment, which it initially viewed as part of the development of collection policy, should be a fourth area of study. During the next few months four task forces coordinated by the Study Committee will examine these areas. Their recommendations are to be submitted to the committee by June 15, 1984, and the committee will prepare its final report by August 30.

This interim report reflects an attempt to gather and assess data relevant to the work of the task forces. The committee has sought to identify the persons and forces primarily responsible for the building of Duke's library collections. It has sought to answer such questions as the following: Who has been responsible for selecting and acquiring library materials in the past, and how have these activities been organized? What are the current strengths and weaknesses of the collections? What level of funding for acquisitions has been provided in the past and what level can be anticipated in the near future? How have funds from various sources been allocated and used? What environmental factors will influence collection development at Duke in the next few years?

The Study Committee realizes that the task forces will need to gather additional data about present conditions and about alternatives available. We believe, however, that the information contained in this report will help to illuminate the context within which decisions must be made. Charges to the task forces are included in the report.

It should be noted that the Study Committee and its task forces are concerned primarily with operations and policies of the Perkins Library system. Headed by the University Librarian, who reports to the office of the Provost, the Perkins system includes, besides Perkins Library itself, nine branch libraries: Biology/Forestry, Chemistry, Divinity School, East Campus, Engineering, Marine Laboratory, Math/Physics, Music, and Undergraduate. The Fuqua School of Business Library, the Law School Library, and the Medical Center Library are separately administered and funded libraries and have been mentioned only as they relate to collection development in Perkins. However, the library statistics used in university reports and submitted by the university to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) include these libraries as well as Perkins, and this fact should be borne in mind with regard to certain statistics used in this report.

The Study Committee hopes that this interim report will inform not only task force members but also other members of the university community concerning the directions our study is taking. We would welcome constructive criticism and comments on any part of the report and, in particular, on the objectives and goals outlined for collection development and the assignments made to the task forces.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

An academic library such as Duke's functions within a highly complex environment. The nature of its objectives in the area of collection development and its success in fulfilling those objectives are influenced by numerous factors as diverse as population trends, the strength of the dollar, the selection of key university administrators, and federal legislation. In examining the environment within which collection development occurs at Duke, the Study Committee has focused its attention particularly on four areas: university goals, research and instructional programs, fiscal factors, and trends in the publishing industry.

University Goals

President Terry Sanford, addressing the annual meeting of the faculty on October 27, 1983, identified a superior faculty, an outstanding library, highly qualified graduate students, inspired undergraduate teaching, and creative research as continuing goals for Duke University. In this address and in others within the past year by the university's new Provost, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Chairman of the Academic Council, there have been several recurring themes--that building an excellent research institution with outstanding graduate programs and offering a superior undergraduate education are compatible and indeed complementary goals; that the university is committed to a vigorous pursuit of excellence in all it undertakes; that the quest for excellence has been most successful thus far in undergraduate programs; and that renewed emphasis is needed upon the research role and graduate programs of the university. Reflecting on Duke's rapid ascent to the stature of a distinguished university, President Sanford pointed out that the university's first president, William Preston Few, sought especially a first-rate faculty, a distinguished research library, and a highly competent student population. He quoted Dr. Few's statement that "more than anything else here our Graduate School will determine the sort of University we are to build in its standing in the education world."

The current quest for excellence follows a period of retrenchment during the late 1970s and the first year or two of the 1980s. Under the leadership of then Chancellor Kenneth Pye, the university sought to identify those programs or activities to which it should no longer devote its resources. The phasing out of the undergraduate nursing program was begun; undergraduate majors in management sciences and education were eliminated, as were most graduate programs in education. Excellence in academic programs was a key concern during retrenchment as well as afterward, and by trimming down the university's commitments, the process of retrenchment laid the groundwork for renewed growth in areas of priority. Nevertheless, the expectations generated by retrenchment both for the university in general and for the library contrast sharply with present projections. In the 1978 document, Planning for the Eighties, Chancellor Pye spoke of the possibility of gradually reducing faculty size by roughly 15%. Instead the size of the faculty is being increased modestly, with at least six to eight new positions anticipated for 1984/85. Planning for the Eighties suggested that it would not be possible or desirable to continue to acquire library materials at the present rate or to maintain the current national ranking of the library. In his 1983 address to the faculty, however, President Sanford affirmed that "we do not intend to permit our library to slip from its superior position."

In sum, the university is committed to improving its stature as a distinguished research university. Strengthening the library's collections is an integral part of that effort. In terms of current holdings the Duke University Libraries rank 19th among the nation's colleges and universities, but as late as 1959/60 Duke's rank was 13th. Whether the former stature of the Duke Libraries can be regained and the superior level of Duke's library resources maintained depends in large part on funding. Only once in the past twenty years has Duke's rank among college and university libraries been better than 30th in terms of expenditures for library materials. (See Table 1.) Nevertheless, in reaffirming the university's commitment to the directions set by Dr. Few, President Sanford indicated, as he had in his 1982 address to the faculty, that the high costs involved in meeting these goals should not be a deterrent to attaining them and that the administration was committed to obtaining the necessary financial resources. The library's goals should reflect those of the university, and at present the library can anticipate carrying out its collection development operations in an environment of renewed emphasis on growth toward excellence as a research institution.

It should be noted also that the university administration is committed to improving communication with the library as priorities are determined for the anticipated enhancement of instructional and research programs. The library has in recent years had to operate without adequate information concerning priorities in teaching and research. Both the university administration and the library administration recognize that improved communication is essential for proper planning in collection development and that the growth of library resources must be coordinated with the growth of university programs.

Research and Instructional Programs

The basic research and instructional components of Duke University are the Trinity College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School, the School of Engineering, the School of Law, the Divinity School, the School of Medicine, the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, and the Fuqua School of Business. Trinity College grew out of Union Institute, an academy begun in a log schoolhouse in Randolph County, North Carolina, in 1839. Moved to Durham in 1892 the college was the core around which Duke University was organized in 1924. The Graduate School was developed, the College's School of Law became the Duke University School of Law, and other schools were established: the Divinity School in 1926;

the School of Medicine in 1930; the School of Forestry, now the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, in 1938; and the Graduate School of Business Administration, now the Fuqua School of Business, in 1969. Today more than 9,000 students are enrolled in the university's programs and schools. (See Table 2.)

Undergraduate Programs

Liberal arts education at Duke allows a number of options. However, as is true of most liberal arts schools, there are required areas of study. The teaching departments are divided into three divisions of learning: Humanities, which include art, Asian and African languages, classical studies, comparative literature, dance, drama, English, Germanic languages and literature, Judaic studies, music, philosophy, religion, Romance languages, and Slavic languages and literature; Natural Sciences and Mathematics, which include biology, botany, chemistry, computer science, genetics, geology, marine sciences, mathematics, physics, statistics, and zoology; and Social Sciences, which include anthropology, economics, education, history, physical education, political science, psychology, public policy studies, and sociology. Students must take courses in each of the three divisions as well as one course in each of three selected fields of knowledge: history of civilization, literature, and empirical natural sciences. These courses must deal with the essential subject matter of a discipline rather than with the acquisition of skills. There is also a requirement that students display foreign language competence at the level of a third semester course and that they take one course in English composition. The final requirement deals with Small Group Learning Experiences that involve students in courses designated as seminars, tutorials, preceptorials, discussion groups or independent study. These requirements are designed to give the student breadth of intellectual experience.

Students must also achieve mastery of a particular discipline or interdisciplinary area as demonstrated by completion of a departmental major, an interdisciplinary major, or an interdepartmental concentration. Duke offers a wide variety of programs to suit the interests of the undergraduates. There are 29 departments and 4 special programs that offer majors. (See Table 3 for listing of departments and degrees. See Table 4 for listing of special programs.) In selection of majors the undergraduate body at Duke is heavily pre-professional. (See Table 5 for enrollment by major. See Table 6 for degrees granted by division and by major.)

Graduate School

The Graduate School offers Master of Arts, Master of Science, Master of Health Administration, and Doctor of Philosophy degrees. Twenty-five departments in the Arts and Sciences and eight in the Medical Center offer graduate degrees through the Graduate School. Many special programs offer both graduate and post-graduate courses but not degrees. (See Table 7 for enrollment by major and Table 8 for degrees by major.)

The size of the Graduate School has declined in recent years. Despite strong programs in the Medical Center, the graduate enrollment there has also slipped. These declines have been attributed to the drying up of federal funds as well as the shortage of jobs in research fields. The current Capital Campaign for the Arts and Sciences is seen as a way of strengthening the graduate programs and increasing the enrollment. (See Table 2 for enrollment figures.)

Program and Course Development

In the intellectual world at large, new fields are being developed rapidly. Many of these are interdisciplinary in nature or transcend traditional disciplines. Programs recently established at Duke reflect this trend. On the undergraduate level are new programs in Women's Studies; Science, Technology and Human Values; and Perspectives in Marxism. There are new Ph.D. programs in literature, musicology, and geology; new interdisciplinary doctoral programs in cell and molecular biology, neurobiology, literature, and toxicology; and new masters programs in art, humanities, liberal studies, and music composition. Some of the new programs are in areas in which the Duke library collections have not traditionally been strong. Future programs are also expected in interdisciplinary areas, especially programs crossing schools and departments, for example, Mathematics and Engineering, Engineering and Medicine,and Humanities and Law. Professors from the professional schools will be involved in teaching undergraduates in many of these programs, some of which already exist. The School of Engineering, under its new dean, has plans for extensive growth of the engineering graduate student body in the next seven to eight years. Growth is also expected in the areas of computer science and biotechnology.

Despite the current trend in the growth of interdisciplinary studies, there are forces of resistance. Some programs are eliminated when funding is cut. A department may feel no obligation to continue a program when the interested faculty member departs. Area studies at Duke have declined in the past twenty years though they continue to be of interest both to the faculty and the university administration. Renewed emphasis upon certain area study programs seems likely, but the specific areas in which growth may occur cannot be identified with certainty at present.

The mechanism for introducing new courses and programs at Duke chiefly involves the faculty in departments and programs. A proposal for a new undergraduate course is developed within a department and then submitted to the Committee on Courses of Instruction of the Undergraduate Faculty Council of Arts and Sciences (UFCAS). The Committee reviews the proposal and makes a decision on whether or not to adopt the course. The proposal is not normally considered by the council as a whole. The first public information on the new course appears in the university's bulletin which is issued in March and lists the courses to be taught the following September. New or changed undergraduate degree requirements requested by a department are handled by the Curriculum Committee of UFCAS. New program proposals also appear before this committee. Proposals for new graduate courses go to the Graduate School and are considered by the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty. If the course involves seniors as well as graduate students, it goes before both the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty and the Committee on Courses of Instruction of UFCAS. The minutes of these committees comprise the best source of advance information on new courses and should be available to the library's collection development office.

Faculty

Duke has a tradition of personal faculty attention to students and of devotion to research. Many faculty members are leaders in their fields and authors of significant books and articles. Over the years the size of the faculty has increased from 128 when Duke University was begun in 1924 to 1452 in 1983. The latter figure is the total number of faculty in the entire university. Trinity College of Arts and Sciences has 402 faculty in the three regular ranks, the School of Engineering has 45, the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies has 45, and the Divinity School has 33. There are also approximately 1700 adjunct faculty and clinical faculty. (See Table 9 for numbers of faculty historically and Table 10 for numbers of current faculty by department.)

Each fall a list of new faculty with a brief description of their research interests is published in the Faculty Newsletter. This same listing is also sent to the library. It is more difficult to gather information on the research interests of the existing faculty. Between 1941 and 1967 lists of faculty publications were issued as a part of the university's annual bulletin. Lists for earlier years appeared in the President's annual reports. These lists were discontinued in 1968 and it was not until 1978 that the Provost's Office issued Publications of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, January 1973 - August 1978. Except for lists kept by individual departments, nothing has been done since. Some of the departments prepare brochures or handouts for prospective graduate students. These range in format from a few typed pages to illustrated bulletins. All list faculty members and give information about their current research programs. Unfortunately not every department publishes such a list, and the lists that exist are not circulated to the library.

Faculty in all divisions of the university regard the library as an important resource. The Study Committee sent a survey to members of the faculties of Arts and Sciences, the Divinity School, the School of Engineering, and the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies to discover answers to several questions concerning faculty assessment of the collections in support of research and teaching, new directions planned in research, new courses being developed, faculty involvement in the selection of materials for the library and faculty satisfaction with collection development procedures. Approximately 580 questionnaires were sent out. Responses were received from 171 individuals. (See Appendix A for copy of survey form.)

Respondents were asked to rank the collections from 1 to 10 (1 being low and 10 high) in support of their teaching and research. On average the 171 respondents ranked teaching support as 8 .6 with the low being 5.9 and the high being 10.0. The mean rank for research support was 7.3, varying from a low of 3.2 to a high of 9 .2. (See Table 11.)

Of the 171 responding to the survey, 66 faculty members said they frequently recommended materials for purchase, 91 occasionally and 11 never. Three did not respond to the question. Many of the respondents made comments on their involvement. Lack of time was often cited as a reason for failure to participate to the degree deemed desirable. A significant number of faculty members do not seem to be aware of procedures for recommending materials or of what happens to recommendations once made. There were also comments on the need for selection overview by someone other than faculty, on the need for bibliographers to prevent gaps in the collection, and on the need for more funds and more space. (See Appendix B for summary of survey responses by department.)

It is apparent that the Duke University Libraries are expected to support a total educational program which seeks "distinction in all the major disciplines of the arts and sciences at the undergraduate and graduate levels and in all areas of professional education to which we are committed."[1] The university's faculty is strongly oriented toward research, and new courses, programs, and research interests are constantly evolving. Structures that facilitate communication between the library and the academic community it serves are needed to link collection development with the continuing development of academic programs and research interests.

Fiscal Factors

For the twelfth consecutive year, Duke University has operated with a balanced budget. In spite of problems that plague all private universities, including high rates of inflation and increased costs, a balanced budget has been maintained by exercising more stringent controls over expenses and obtaining new sources of income, including income from gifts, recovery of indirect expenses, increased enrollment, and annual increases in tuition. Despite retrenchment, which aimed at tailoring the university's aims to budgetary projections and constraining all-encompassing growth, total university expenditures have nearly doubled between 1977/78 and 1982/83, increasing from $231,226,684 to $431,303,000. As President Sanford stated in the university's 1983 financial report, "The price of excellence is steadily rising at a faster rate than income from Duke's traditional sources and is creating a greater need for additional endowment funds."

Since its inception in 1924 Duke University has received annually 32% of the income of The Duke Endowment, a private foundation distinct from the university, plus special gifts and grants from The Endowment. Total income received from The Endowment in 1982/83 was approximately $13,840,000. The university's own endowment and quasi-endowment funds, worth approximately $219 million, provided an additional income of $12,328,000. Duke has far to go to match such institutions as Harvard, with an endowment of $1.8 billion; Yale, $1 billion; or Princeton, $900 million.

To increase the university's endowment the Capital Campaign for the Arts and Sciences is now being launched, having thus far received pre-campaign pledges of approximately $32 million. This campaign seeks to raise $150 to $200 million to double the current university endowment and produce an annual income equal to the amount now received from The Duke Endowment. The success of efforts to raise Duke's national standing as a research institution, including efforts to improve the ranking of its libraries, will depend in large part upon the success of the Capital Campaign for the Arts and Sciences.

The university relies greatly upon funding from other sources: gifts, grants, and contracts; auxiliary enterprises; investments; and tuition. During fiscal year 1982/83 Duke received $36,009,454 from private gifts, grants, and contracts. This total represents an 8.7% increase over 1981/82 and an 11.8% increase over the previous three-year average. Gifts to endowment experienced the greatest gain in 1982/83, going from $3.7 million to $7.7 million, an increase of 106%.

With regard to the university's financial support of its libraries, the early record was an excellent one. As has been mentioned previously, the first president of Duke had as a primary goal the building of an outstanding library. Dr. Few personally directed expeditions to buy collections from all over the world to establish an instantly remarkable research library. Library annual reports reveal that from 1930 to 1949/50, Duke ranked ninth among American university libraries in annual expenditures for books and periodicals. During the depression years of 1932-1936, only Harvard, among American university libraries, spent more. For fifteen years the libraries received an average of 8% of the educational budget, ranging from 10.7% in 1936/37 to 6.2% in 1948/49.[2] The percentage has declined through the years to a low point of 4.1% in 1981/82. The 1983 Financial Report indicates a slight increase for 1982/83 to 4.2%, but this increase is explained by the first time inclusion of the new Fuqua School of Business Library. To maintain an even comparison, the removal of the Fuqua expenses reveals that the remaining library systems received 4.1% of the educational and general expenditures budget in 1982/83 as in 1981/82. (See Table 12.)

In sum, it can be said that because of the early years of support, the Duke Libraries have been able to maintain their national ranking among the top twenty ARL libraries in size of collection. With declining levels of support, ground is being lost. Even though dollar amounts have increased, they have been inadequate to cover inflation in book and serial prices. The average annual increase for materials expenditure in the Perkins system during the past ten years was 7.9%. The average increase in cost for materials published in the United States was 8.8% for books and 13% for periodical subscriptions during the decade. The library has been unable to maintain its former rate of acquisitions. The acquisition of monographs has been particularly affected since the ongoing serial commitments, essential especially in the scientific fields, were generally maintained until very recently. Since the 1980/81 fiscal year efforts have been made to reduce the number of serial standing orders. Currently the science libraries must cancel subscriptions equivalent to 125% of the cost of any new periodical subscription they initiate.

It should also be noted that the Perkins Library system is heavily dependent on allocated funding since its endowed funding is inadequate to provide substantial income. For 1982/83 the endowment income, including restricted funds, for the Perkins system accounted for only 4.3% of the library's income. Even when grants and gifts are included with endowment income, the percentage of this type of library funding, inclusive for all libraries on campus, during the past ten years has averaged only 9.5% of total library expenditures. (See Table 13 for university appropriations; Table 14 for expenditures according to sources of funds; and Table 15 for a comparison of materials expenditures in Perkins, Law, Medical Center, and Fuqua Libraries.)

Besides income from regular endowments, the library has from time to time received special appropriations. The Duke Endowment allocated $600,000 in the 1960s to be spent for retrospective materials over a three-to-four-year period. The university administration decided that the money should support current materials as well, thus reducing the need for university appropriations.

In addition to The Duke Endowment funds, the library has received through the years grants from foundations and from the U.S. Government and portions of grants awarded to other offices or programs on campus. As the following examples indicate, the thrust of many of the grants has been to support area studies. The Ford Foundation gave the library $286,000 (total for 1966/67 and 1967/68), most of which was unrestricted. There were additional Ford Foundation grants (1970/71 and 1972/73) to support Afro-American studies and also East Asian and South Asian studies. The Rockefeller Foundation has given grants in amounts from $1,000 to $10,000 to support African or Afro-American studies during the years 1968/69 through 1975/76. In addition to cooperative collection development grants to Duke, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and North Carolina State University, there have been several small HEW grants to support Afro-American studies, Canadian studies, Third World studies, etc. Acquisitions for Japanese studies have been supported by grants from the Japan World Exposition (1974/75) and Japanese Studies (1980/81). The Center for International Studies has been awarded grants from which the library received funds to support various area study programs in most years since 1972/73. From 1981 (through June 1984) grant funds from the Science, Technology, and Human Values program were made available for the purchase of materials in that broad interdisciplinary area. The Canadian Embassy has provided funds for purchase of materials in Canadian studies.

A discussion of library funding in today's environment must consider the reality that the book budget is inevitably in competition with other large funding needs within the library. The amount needed for automation, including an online catalog, for retrospective conversion of earlier cataloging to AACR2 cataloging rules and machine-readable form, and for preservation of deteriorating library materials is in the millions of dollars. None of these undertakings are possible without additional funding, but how future budgets are divided among various needs will have a significant effect on collection development efforts.

Trends in the Publishing Industry

In the last decade stringent economics and advances in technology have led to substantial changes in the publishing industry. These changes are so fundamental and pervasive that they not only are affecting the formats in which libraries acquire materials but are requiring libraries to reassess the relationships between the acquisition of materials and the provision of services.

Costs and Output

Rising costs have altered the traditional structure of the domestic publishing industry, and the realities of these economics have forced publishers to take a serious look at the impact of technology on both their operations and their product line. Between 1978 and 1982 manufacturing costs alone rose 47.1% while unit output increased only 10.9%. Overhead costs and the cost of money have risen in staggering proportions. These costs have forced a change from an industry where the major trade publishing houses were small and independent, often managed by the owners, to an industry where the major houses are owned by highly diversified conglomerate corporations. University presses have gone through similar difficult times; several have gone out of business while others such as the University Presses of New England joined forces in order to survive.

These hard economic times would seem to spell doom for the small publisher; instead there has been significant growth in the number of small presses. The 1981/82 Books in Print covered 600,000 titles from 11,800 publishers, and there are perhaps an additional 9,900 publishers who were inactive that year. Previously the small publisher was an idealistic entrepreneur; today small publishers are corporations, societies, cause and movement organizations, research and educational institutions, foundations, trade associations, unions and other media such as newspapers and broadcasting firms. Microcomputer technology, creative marketing techniques, and specialized topics have enabled the smaller publisher to flourish while larger publishing houses attempt to stay abreast by reducing overhead, utilizing current technology and issuing shorter print runs to reduce capital outlay.

While individual firms struggle to survive, worldwide publishing output is expanding. The UNESCO Yearbook shows that between 1972 and 1979 publishing output rose 17.8% in Spain, 25.5% in Britain, 47.8% in West Germany, 111.0% in Brazil, and 7.7% in the United States. Periodical publishing has undergone a similar expansion. The growth and increasing specialization of academic fields has led to increasing numbers of periodical titles, and, due to their relative currency, researchers rely more heavily on periodicals as a source of information, particularly in the sciences.

In the last ten to fifteen years the cost of materials has increased more dramatically than the quantity of output. The cost of an average hardbound book published in the United States increased 162.3% from $11.66 to $30.59 between 1970 and 1982. (See Table 16.) Periodical subscription prices showed even more exaggerated increases. The average subscription price for a domestic periodical rose 382.5% from $10.41 to $50.23 between 1970 and 1983. (See Table 17.)

To understand the real implications for academic libraries, these statistics must be examined more closely. Included in the average increase in the cost of a hardbound book is an increase of 171.5% in the cost of a book in technology, 108.1% in the cost of a book in history and 190.2% in the cost of a book in sciences. (See Table 16.) Similarly, increases in periodical subscription prices have varied widely in different subject fields: 521.6% in chemistry and physics, 146.1% in philosophy and religion, 225.1% in history, and 506.3% in engineering. (See Table 16.) These increases in the costs of library materials should be compared with the 172.8% increase in the consumer price index between 1970 and 1982. In a period of retrenchment in higher education few libraries' materials budgets have kept pace with the escalation of costs. The Book Industry Study Group estimates that libraries have spent 38.3% more for materials in 1982 than in 1977 but have purchased .5% fewer units, and they predict that this trend will continue with libraries spending 22.5% more for materials in 1987 but purchasing 5.4% fewer units. (See Table 18.) Clearly libraries have suffered a loss of buying power.

Not only have libraries had to struggle with the increasing volume and costs of materials, but the cost of money and inventories have forced publishers to reduce the size of print runs. Libraries are now faced with limited availability of titles initially and little likelihood of obtaining at reasonable costs additional or replacement copies of titles should they be needed.

Technological Change

When microforms were introduced into the library market, it was predicted that they would revolutionize libraries by replacing the printed work. Lack of user acceptance has prevented this development, but microforms represent a growing portion of library collections. Libraries now rely on microforms to solve some storage and preservation problems. Collections of rare and archival works are made available on microform. Some out-of-print and low use titles are available as "on demand" microforms, and the Government Printing Office is issuing increasing numbers of government publications only in microform.

The early 1980s have brought a sudden increase in the variety and quantity of materials available in non-traditional formats. Videocassettes and videodiscs, popular for home use, are also claiming a portion of library materials resources. Videocassettes of commercial films and original works are now readily available, and the equipment to play them is affordable. Videodiscs have not reached the same level of acceptance due to the lack of standardization of the hardware and the limited number of programs available for viewing.

Economic factors have provided incentives for publishers to explore other innovative means of producing and distributing their products. Computers are the primary tool being used for these purposes and the resultant machine-readable files have spawned a rapid growth in electronic publishing. The use of the term "electronic publishing" varies widely in the literature, but as used here it is broadly defined as the distribution of materials which are in machine-readable form and are displayed via a screen of some sort, be it a computer terminal, a television or some other type of screen.

The most familiar form of electronic publishing is data base publishing. Many online data bases originated as a by-product of publishers' efforts to automate index production. These index files resulted in data bases which could also be used to access bibliographic information. These reference data bases have multiplied rapidly and more recently source data bases, containing the full text of publications such as the Foundation Directory, the Academic American Encyclopedia and the journals of the American Chemical Society, have been created. As increasing quantities of up-to-date information and sources are available online, libraries are faced with the difficult decision of whether to purchase print copies of titles that are available online. Libraries must also anticipate that as patrons gain greater awareness of online sources there will be increasing demand for online services, and further, with improvements in document delivery systems, patrons may bypass the library altogether for some of their information needs.

Another outgrowth of the technological production of printed sources is the development of machine-readable data files. These files contain numeric or textual data in coded form which must be interpreted by machine. To facilitate evaluation and analysis of the data scholars are creating and converting data into machine-readable form with increasing frequency. By no means is this limited to the number-crunching applications traditionally associated with such technology. A project underway at Rutgers University is producing an inventory of machine-readable texts in the humanities. It is estimated that the inventory will have more than 7000 listings when it is complete.

Optical discs are still in an evolutionary phase. Experiments are underway to use optical discs for high density storage of bibliographic, textual and visual (slides and photographs) sources. The storage of such resources has broad implications for the preservation of library materials. It offers the potential for wide distribution of library collections previously available only at specific institutions. Eventually sources now available online may be distributed on optical discs and searched locally on micro-processors, thus avoiding costly communication charges.

As the prevalence of microcomputers grows, there will be changes in scholarly publishing and communication. Brokers are now supplying electronic services to owners of personal computers. The Source is a notable example; it has 14,222 subscribers who access its services via their computers. These services include provision of information such as airline schedules, electronic mail services, and, more recently, a user-publishing service. User-publishing is perhaps the ultimate vanity press, but it represents a growing trend. Using their own computers, researchers communicate with each other via electronic mail and perhaps eventually via scholarly 'user-publishing' services, exchanging information that previously would have been available through traditional publishing channels. It is only a matter of time until library patrons may want access not only to computer software for use on their personal computers but also to scholarly services similar to the Source to keep up with recent developments in their fields.

Perkins Library is not immune to these changes in the publishing industry nor to the changing demands of patrons increasingly conversant with new technologies. Since 1970 materials expenditures for the Perkins system have risen 109.4% while the cost of domestic hardbound books has risen 162.3% and domestic periodicals 382.5%. It is difficult to determine the effect of this dichotomy on the collections, however, because there has been a lack of statistical information available concerning the library's collecting patterns. Collection Development has made tremendous progress over the last three years in monitoring spending patterns, but they have been unable to undertake development of local price indexes which are a valuable tool for anticipating the impact of national cost trends on our local situation. An automated system is in place which ought to be utilized to provide management statistics for collection development, but it is a largely untapped resource. A comparison of figures provided by vendors who supply materials to Perkins Library indicates that the average cost of a book purchased for Perkins is 23% higher than the national average, $26.05 for Perkins and $21.14 for the national average, and comparisons for periodicals indicate that Perkins' average cost of $65.85 is 31% higher than the national average of $50.23. (See Table 19.) Our local trends may be due to an emphasis on periodicals in the sciences, but at this time the explanation is only conjecture.

Within the already strained materials budget there is a growing demand for alternative formats. Videocassettes are becoming an integral part of the teaching curriculum, as demonstrated by the growth of the Perkins collection to 150 cassettes in just two years. Likewise there are requests for computer software, and faculty have requested machine-readable files for use in textual analysis. Only recently has the Reference Department broadened the use of online data base searching, and decisions must now be made concerning the purchase of limited use titles which are available online.

The rise in prices, the increased production of books and journals in print formats, and the growing availability of materials in alternative formats make it increasingly difficult for research libraries to build their collections responsibly. Budgets must be stretched over a larger universe of resources available, and staff must be increasingly aware of the diverse alternatives available to meet the needs of patrons. Libraries must achieve a balance between purchasing materials regardless of format, and offering access to sources not owned by the library. As increasing quantities of users' needs are met utilizing online sources, money previously allocated for print materials may need to be spent to provide online access. These issues demonstrate the need for clearly outlined collection development policies which can serve as a framework for building the library's resources regardless of format.

HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

In 1924, when Duke University was established as one of the provisions of James Buchanan Duke's indenture of trust, the library of Trinity College contained approximately 90,000 volumes. Six years later, when the library was moved to the newly-built West Campus, there were nearly 200,000 volumes.[3] During the next decade the size of the collection increased by 210 percent[4] and Duke became one of thirty-seven charter members of the Association of Research Libraries, founded in December 1932. By 1940, according to statistics published by Princeton University, only twelve academic institutions in the country had library holdings larger than Duke's. Thus the transformation of Trinity College into Duke University involved the growth of a good-sized college library into a major research library.

Most of the major components of Duke's library systems were established during those early years of growth. In September 1930 the library was moved from East Campus to several locations on West Campus. Established at that time were a new hospital library in the medical school, a new law library in the law school (its collection being that of the former law room in the General Library), a new General Library (now Perkins Library), a departmental library within the new School of Religion building (now the Divinity School Library), and three branch science libraries-- Biology, Chemistry, and Physics-- in their respective departments. The collections of the branch science libraries were those of the relevant disciplines that had been housed in the college's General Library, but they had originated as departmental collections before Trinity College was moved to Durham in 1892. Forestry materials were soon added to the biology library and mathematics books and journals to the physics library. The Engineering School remained on East Campus until 1947 and had a separate collection of engineering books and journals. The Woman's College Library (now East Campus Library) occupied the building formerly housing the General Library and started the school year in September 1930 with a new collection of some 4,000 volumes. This collection consisted of materials in the fine arts and books and journals suitable for a general undergraduate collection.

With holdings of 3,300,886 volumes as of June 30, 1983, the Duke Libraries have continued to experience significant growth since 1940. According to ARL statistics the Duke Libraries ranked 13th among the nation's academic libraries in 1946/47, and they remained either 13th or 14th through 1960/61. Duke's national ranking began to slip in the early 1960s. It was 19th in 1963/64 and remained in the 18th to 20th range through 1981/82, being 19th for nine of those years. (See Table 1 for rankings and Table 20 for growth of collections by library within the Perkins system.)

Only four new components of the library systems have been established since 1940. A small reference library was established at the Duke University Marine Laboratory in Beaufort in 1948. Before that summer, books and journals had been brought from the main library in Durham as needed. In 1970 the undergraduate collection became the basis of the new Undergraduate Library, occupying much of the space vacated in 1969 when the General Library collections were moved into the Perkins Library building. The Music Library was established in 1974 in the new Biddle Building on East Campus, and the collection of music books and scores housed in the East Campus Library was moved to the new library. Finally, in 1983 the library of the Fuqua School of Business was opened as an independently administered library. Its initial collection included materials transferred from Perkins, but since it is to be a working library only, Perkins retains research materials needed for graduate students and faculty in business fields.

Developers of the Collections

Both faculty members and librarians have played crucial roles in developing the Duke libraries, with the role of the faculty particularly important in the early years. In 1924 faculty members did most of the ordering of library materials. Dr. William Kenneth Boyd of the History Department was the chief organizer of this endeavor, and in 1930 he became Director of Libraries. In the late 1920s and during the 1930s he was instrumental in acquiring by gift and purchase both printed and manuscript materials relating to the southern United States. These materials became the basis of the Flowers Collection of Southern Americana which was augmented under the direction of Professor Robert H. Woody until 1948 when the library assumed responsibility for collecting Southern Americana with the support of the George Washington Flowers Memorial Fund, established in 1941.

Several early faculty members involved in collection development had catholic tastes and ordered materials outside their own fields. Outstanding examples were William Hamilton (History) and Allan Gilbert (English), both of whom had interests beyond their teaching fields. Other faculty members who played major roles in collection building during the early years were Professors P. F. Baum, Clarence Gohdes, and Jay B. Hubbell of the English Department; Louise Hall, Art; John Tate Lanning, History; W. H. Glasson, Political Science and Economics; Paul M. Gross and Frances Brown, Chemistry; Hugo F. Blomquist and Paul Kramer, Botany; Arthur S. Pearse and George T. Hargill, Zoology; Clarence Korstian, Forestry; J. Miller Thomas, Mathematics; Walter M. Nielsen, Physics; and Walter Seeley, Engineering.

The Library Council was also involved in collection development. Established by the faculty of the university in 1928, it was essentially the same as the Library Committee that had functioned since 1894. This faculty body (the University Librarian was originally an ex officio member; now several librarians are members) approved the materials budget, including the allocation of the student fee fund to departments for library purchases. Until 1976 a certain portion of the materials budget was allocated to the Library Council for purchase of expensive titles or large collections, items that cut across departmental lines, and materials for departments that had exhausted their funds.

In 1930, the same year that the library moved to West Campus, the first order librarian, Eric Morrell, was appointed. Morrell had been a bibliographer at the New York Public Library. He maintained close ties with the faculty and encouraged their acquisition efforts but he also called titles to their attention for the purpose of ordering. Morrell saw all orders before they were sent out, and he had contacts with British and European book dealers, developed while he was at New York Public, which he used to the library's advantage. One of Morrell's legacies to Duke's collection building was making Duke's needs known to these dealers so that they could be searching for desired items.

Faculty members at this time were still acquiring collections for the library as they came upon them, with the university allocating special funds for this purpose as situations arose. For example, during this period, Professor William Laprade of the History Department obtained the basic and comprehensive collection of British government documents.

Under Morrell, reference librarians began ordering some materials, mostly reference sources but also some general titles. This pattern continued until after World War II when other staff members with subject specialties began to be part of the collection development effort.

Morrell was also responsible for developing the library's exchange program although in the early years the program was more a matter of acquiring gifts since Duke had nothing to exchange. One early gift collection was twenty tons of materials from the John Crerar Library in Chicago. Many of these items were runs of science serials. Later the library bought Duke Press journals and books at a good discount and used them for exchange. Since most exchanges were for serials, the head of serials, Miss Gertrude Merritt, who had joined the staff in 1931, eventually handled these arrangements. She consulted faculty members when requests were received from institutions interested in exchanges, and decisions were made jointly on whether an exchange or purchase would be more appropriate in a given instance.

Though Morrell began the program of serial standing orders by making a concerted effort to continue serial and periodical runs started before the Depression, Miss Merritt was responsible for developing the standing order procedures that now exist. Several of the European book dealers with whom Duke had dealt extensively were instrumental in acquiring both back files and standing orders for future materials. Some of the dealers stockpiled materials for Duke during World War II and sent them to Durham after the war.

With regard to continuing library staff involvement in collection development, Morrell's successor as head of acquisitions, Jerome K. Wilcox, was particularly interested in government documents. Wilcox's successor, John J. Lund, who became head of acquisitions in 1937, was interested in comparative literature and began collecting Scandinavian literature, building on a 1930 purchase. In 1939 Mortimer Taube became head of acquisitions when Lund became Librarian for the university.

Taube continued strong relationships with the faculty but was especially interested in the fields of economics and political science. As Librarian, Lund had envisioned a staff of subject specialists who would work jointly in selecting, cataloging, and reference but he did not remain long enough at Duke to establish such a staffing pattern.

It should be mentioned at this point that John J. Lund became the university's first autonomous Librarian for what is now the Perkins system, with the resignation of Professor Harvie Branscomb as Director of Libraries in 1941. From 1930 to 1934 Professor Boyd had served as Director of Libraries, with the librarians of the General Library, the Law Library, the Medical Library and the Woman's College Library reporting to him. In 1934 Dr. Branscomb assumed this position and held it until his resignation in 1941. Thereafter the librarians of the three separate systems-- General, including Woman's College and branch libraries; Law; and Medical-- assumed the direction of their respective libraries.

When Lund resigned in 1943, Joseph P. Breedlove, who had served as Librarian from 1898 to 1939, became Acting Librarian and served in that capacity until 1946 when Benjamin E. Powell was appointed Librarian. Miss Merritt, who was already head of technical services, temporarily assumed additional responsibilities for acquisition functions shortly before Dr. Powell's arrival and was essentially the chief collection development officer until her retirement in 1979. For more than thirty years she was the person primarily responsible for the immense growth of Duke's collection in an orderly and comprehensive fashion through consulting with faculty and library staff, especially the reference librarians, and through maintaining the relationships already established with European book dealers. Her personal knowledge of the collection allowed her to build upon its strengths and maintain the library's resources for research.

Both Miss Merritt and Dr. Powell encouraged increased library staff involvement in collection development. Prominent among library staff members involved in selection were Dr. Edward J. Meyers, bibliographical consultant and subject cataloger, who was active in selecting material in art, philosophy, and literature; Winston Broadfoot, Director of the Flowers Collection; George Ehlhardt, librarian in the Divinity School Library; and reference librarians, who were involved in selection both for the Reference Department and for the general collection.

Cooperation

Like patterns of faculty and library staff involvement in acquisitions, cooperative activities, both with the other libraries at Duke and with the libraries of neighboring institutions, have been a major factor in shaping the growth of the Perkins collections. Cooperation among the separately administered Duke libraries exists by means of informal agreements worked out by librarians, who first and foremost serve their clienteles. The two professional school libraries of law and medicine have developed strong research collections while the Perkins Library serves the research needs of the Fuqua School of Business. The Perkins system is also a necessary resource for several graduate departments in the Medical School, such as anatomy, biochemistry, and pharmacology. In turn faculty and graduate students in certain departments within Trinity College, such as psychology, are dependent on the Medical School Library in some areas of research.

Duke is in an ideal location to cooperate with the libraries at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) and North Carolina State University in Raleigh (NCSU). Since the 1930s formal and informal cooperative agreements have been worked out between Duke and UNC-CH, some examples of which follow:

1933 The Committee on Intellectual Cooperation was appointed by the presidents of Duke and UNC-CH to explore ways of cooperation in all areas between the two institutions. Both university librarians were on this committee.

1933 Privileges for borrowing in person were extended to faculty members of both institutions. Stack and interlibrary loan privileges were granted to graduate students of the other institution. Later the borrowing in person privilege was extended to graduate students.

1934 Author cards in each catalog were duplicated and given to the other library. This was made possible with a grant from the General Education Board of New York and was the beginning of the North Carolina Union Catalog, which was housed at UNC-CH and put on microfilm during the 1970s. The filmed catalog and a supplement bring holdings to about 1976. The microfiche catalog of the Triangle universities is one current method of sharing holdings information among Duke, UNC-CH, and NCSU; access to OCLC is another. Also, the three libraries exchange their lists of serial holdings on microfiche as the lists are periodically generated.

1935 Daily document delivery service was inaugurated between the two libraries. Now NCSU is included.

A grant of $50,000 was jointly awarded to the two libraries by the General Education Board of New York to build up research collections in biological, physical, and social sciences and in English literature. There was a formalized outline of areas of subject concentration in these fields for the two libraries.

1937 Agreement was made on the division of fields in collecting federal and state documents; refinements to this agreement were made in the 1940s. This agreement has become obsolete with changing local programs and changing patterns of publication and distribution. UNC-CH is now a regional depository for U.S. government publications and Duke a selective depository. However, in 1983 the documents librarians in the Duke, UNC-CH and NCSU libraries worked out an understanding relating to the purchase of publications issued by certain international agencies.

1940-1945 The Rockefeller Foundation awarded a grant to the libraries of Duke, UNC-CH, and Tulane to purchase Latin American materials, especially those in history, economics, and political science. Country responsibilities were as follows: Duke-- Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Colombia; UNC-CH-- Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela; and Tulane-- Mexico, Central America, and the West Indies.

1950s 1960s Joint purchases have been made by the two libraries, examples being the Landmarks of Science (actually purchased by Duke, UNC-CH, and NCSU), which is housed at Duke, and the publications listed in German Baroque Literature: A Catalog of the Collection in Yale University Library, which are at UNC-CH.

There have been understandings concerning geographical responsibility in addition to the Latin American arrangement developed in the early 1940s. These geographical responsibilities do not preclude libraries' collecting at a basic level for any area. There are no formal documents for these agreements, and they are kept up by the two libraries as they have the funds to support purchases in these areas:

		DUKE	UNC-CH
Latin America			
primary:	Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru	X	
secondary:	Central America, Panama	X	
primary:	Argentina, Chile, Cuba, Venezuela		X
secondary:	Caribbean Area, Paraguay, Uruguay		X
Far East (materials in the vernacular):			
Japan		X	
China			X
Russia/Soviet Union:			
Pre-1917			X
Post-1917		X	
Africa:			
Former Commonwealth countries		X	
Other African countries			X
South Asia		X	
Poland		X	
Czechoslovakia			X
Yugoslavia			X
Canada		X	
Australia		X	
New Zealand		X	

Since 1976, when the Triangle Universities Library Cooperation Committee (TULCC) was created for librarians from the three universities to discuss all types of cooperation, there has been a renewed spirit of cooperation among the collection development staffs. The three university libraries received two cooperative collection development HEW grants under Title II-C for 1978/79 ($250,000 total) and for 1980/81 ($250,000 total). In each case $100,000 went to Duke, $100,000 to UNC-CH, and $50,000 to NCSU. In preparation for the second grant, the collection development staffs of the three libraries began meeting quarterly to discuss purchases that the libraries were planning to make with the grant monies. These quarterly meetings continue and provide an open forum for communication. Decisions concerning the acquisition of expensive or very specialized materials are handled by telephone or memo. Recently an agreement clarifying institutional responsibility for serials titles in the Triangle was put into effect. Both UNC-CH and NCSU are members of the Center for Research Libraries, a non-profit organization that acquires and makes available to its members research materials not generally available in the members' own libraries. Duke maintains memberships in three special programs of the Center: the Cooperative Africana Microfilm Project, the Foreign Newspaper Project, and the South Asia Microform Project.

Duke's involvement in cooperation on a national level has been through participation in the Library of Congress Special Foreign Currency Program (formerly PL-480) since 1962. The Duke library already had a substantial South Asian collection of monographic, serial, and manuscript materials, eighteenth century to present. Through the Program the library originally received a comprehensive collection of current materials from Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka in nine vernacular languages and English but due to the gradual phasing out of the Program (cessation date is scheduled for 1987), the profile has been changed. Currently materials are received in English and three vernacular languages--Hindi, Urdu, and Marathi; Marathi will be dropped in October 1984. The research needs relating to South Asian studies at Duke are under constant review so that once the final cessation date is known, the whole program can be examined and decisions made concerning Duke's level of participation in light of available funds.

Perceptions of Collection Strengths

As developed by both faculty and librarians and shaped by cooperative arrangements, general strengths of the Duke library collections include long serial and periodical runs in many subject areas. This is especially true of the collections in the science libraries. Other strengths of the collections are academy and society publications, many of these also serials; government publications, both U.S. and foreign (especially for countries of the British Commonwealth); and newspapers, especially Southern U.S., German, and British. More specific subject area strengths include the following:

- American drama and literature
- British history
- Canadian literature
- Commonwealth studies
- English drama and literature
- Entomology
- Far East materials
- French drama and literature
- German Baroque literature
- Hebrew and Old Testament studies
- International law
- Italian literature
- Latin American history, especially Bolivian, Brazilian, Colombian, Ecuadorian and Peruvian
- Medieval church history
- Military history
- Socialist and Communist literature, including Socialist Party of America papers
- South Asian Studies
- Southern history with an outstanding collection of Confederate imprints
- Theology
- Wesleyana and British Methodism

An unrestricted $274,000 grant from the Ford Foundation in 1966 gave impetus to building upon some of the above strengths and to developing new collections. The following areas were emphasized:

- Africana
- Anthropology and sociology journals
- Art
- British local history
- Classics
- Engineering periodical back files
- Geology journals
- Germanic language and literature, especially medieval periodicals
- History of Science
- Medieval History
- Music
- Newspapers
- Russian
- South Asia, including parliamentary papers and other government publications
- Rare books
- Renaissance materials

Descriptions of library strengths and special collections appear in the following documents: John L. Sharpe, III, and Esther Evans, eds., *Gnomon, Essays for the Dedication of the William R. Perkins Library, April 16, 1970*, Duke University Library, 1970; *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, v.7, 1972, p.314ff; Gertrude Merritt, *Guide to Special Collections*, Duke University Library, 1983 draft; Richard C. Davis and Linda Angle Miller, eds., *Guide to the Cataloged Collections in the Manuscript Department of the William R. Perkins Library, Duke University*, Santa Barbara, Calif., Clio Books, 1980; Title II-C Grant Applications for Cooperative Collection Development Projects with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and North Carolina State University for 1980/81 and for 1982/83.

It should be emphasized, however, that perceptions of strengths in Duke's collections are just that, perceptions. No systematic study of the collections has been made and no systematic means for matching university programs with the collections have been developed, although some of the strong programs at Duke, especially in history and literature, may have been established because of the library's collections in those areas. It is equally impossible, with some few exceptions, to specify which of the strong collections at Duke are now in danger of being out of date or no longer comprehensive. One problem area which has been identified is that of foreign government documents. Although the library continues to obtain with fair regularity the publications of various parliaments for the countries for which there are strong basic collections, many of the departmental documents of those same countries are not now being obtained on a regular basis. In part this situation is due to the fact that standing orders are no longer available, but most of the problem stems from the proliferation of available materials and lack of staff to oversee orderly collection of the types of materials Duke once acquired systematically.

There is no doubt but that the overall Duke library collection is outstanding in quantity and quality. Nevertheless, systematic procedures for assessing specific portions of the collection are needed to identify lacunae and to ensure that materials are being acquired to the extent intended in various subject areas and formats. Written collection policies need to be developed to clarify the levels at which materials are intended to be collected.

CURRENT COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OPERATING PRACTICES

Ultimate responsibility for the selection of materials and disposition of the materials budget rests with the Assistant University Librarian (AUL) for Collection Development. The incumbent in this position, Florence Blakely, determines the apportionment of funds received from university allocations, endowments, and other sources; directs and coordinates the work of other staff members involved in collection development; and generally oversees collection development operations.

Funding

Allocated Funds

Under current operating practices, when the University Librarian reports the amount appropriated by the university for the materials budget, the AUL for Collection Development apportions that amount to the following seven categories:

1	Serials	Money spent for serials regardless of type
2	General	Money set aside for special purchases
3	Miscellaneous	Money for monographic purchases (including departmental allocations)
4	Binding	All binding of both monographs and serials
5	Exchange	Materials purchased by the library for use on exchange
6	Lost Book Fund	Money used for the purchase of lost and missing titles; partially offset by credit for payment received for lost materials
7	Postage	Charges made by suppliers for books sent to the library; includes postage and handling, insurance, and other shipping charges

For 1983/84 the amounts apportioned to these categories (excluding Divinity School monographs and the Duke Marine Laboratory) are as follows:

	Amount	% of Total
Serials	1,064,350.00	63.5
General	30,000.00	1.8
Miscellaneous	360,985.00	21.5
Binding	125,000.00	7.5
Exchange	35,000.00	2.1
Lost Book Fund	10,000.00	0.6
Postage	50,000.00	3.0
Total	1,675,335.00	100.0

The AUL bases the amount apportioned to each category on expenditures of the previous year, taking into account pertinent factors such as inflation. The serials budget is further broken down by type-- periodicals, newspapers, sets and analyzed series, and continuations-- and then apportioned to the libraries of the system. (See Tables 21 and 22.) In the miscellaneous line, $120,000 is allocated to departments and the rest is allocated to subject areas, reference, documents, approval plan purchases, and, normally, standing order press books. The practice of allocating funds to the departments goes back to the use made of the annual library fee, initiated in 1892/93 at $2.00 per student. The fee was increased to $10.00 a year in the 1920s and to $22.00 in the 1960s. When it was discontinued in 1968, income from the fee amounted to $120,000. At that time the university compensated the library for the loss in revenue by providing an equivalent amount in the library's annual appropriation. Since 1968 the library has continued to allocate approximately this amount to the departments for purchases of books.

The $120,000 allocated to the departments represents a small amount of money: 33% of the miscellaneous line and 7% of the overall 1983/84 materials budget. Many faculty research and teaching needs are taken care of in other ways: serial and set standing orders; university press plan; other parts of the miscellaneous line, covered by the subject fund codes; endowed funds; and the general fund for special large purchases.

The formula developed to allocate student library fees to the departments is being used to allocate the $120,000. The allocation is based on the previous fall and spring enrollments of graduate and undergraduate students. For the 1983/84 budget the $120,000 is reduced by $600, which is the standard amount allotted to the Physical Education Department, and the remaining $119,400 is divided as follows. Each department receives an equal share ($1,326.67) of one-third of the $119,400 plus an enrollment allotment ($3.28 per student) from the remaining two-thirds.

Formerly, departmental funds could be carried over from year to year because these funds came from student fees specifically for the library. However, university policy does not allow appropriated funds to be carried over from one fiscal year to the next. If at the end of the year there are funds in the non-materials portion (salaries, etc.) of the library budget and this money is turned over to Collection Development, the money (no matter the amount) must be spent by the end of the fiscal year or forfeited.

Endowed Funds and Other Income

Traditionally the role of endowed funds has been a limited one. Endowments were small in the early years, but in the 1930s (especially 1932/33) they were often the only source of library acquisition funds besides the departmental funds derived from student fees. Later on, as endowment funds grew, they were used to cover overdrafts, especially for serials, and to cover the cost of standing order press books.

Currently there are thirty-five endowed funds available for the purchase of library materials for the Perkins system. Of these, eight are completely unrestricted. The two largest funds are the George Washington Flowers Memorial Fund, which is for the purchase of Southern Americana (both printed materials and manuscripts), and the Mary Duke Biddle Library Fund, which has no restrictions.

During the 1983/84 fiscal year unrestricted endowed funds are being used to support the acquisition of special types of materials, such as audio-visuals and computer tapes; to acquire back files of periodicals; to aid in preservation by replacing deteriorating newsprint material with microfilm; and to support scholarly research by acquiring expensive materials usually of an interdisciplinary nature. They are also being used to purchase standing order university press books. The decision to devote endowment income to these standing orders was made at the beginning of the fiscal year to relieve pressure on appropriated funds.

Staff Positions and Responsibilities

Besides the AUL for Collection Development the staff of the Collection Development Office includes the Ibero-American bibliographer, who spends one-half of his time working on collection development activities; two full-time professional librarians; a staff assistant; and a secretary. Subject areas have not been defined for the two full-time professional positions except that one librarian has responsibility for ordering printed materials on the Southern United States using the Flowers Fund. Others who work with the AUL for Collection Development are:

1) All the branch librarians, including the Divinity School Librarian and the art bibliographer based in the East Campus Library.

2) Librarians in Reference, Public Documents, Newspapers and Microforms, Undergraduate Library (location of audiovisual materials), Rare Book Room, and Manuscripts.

3) The South Asian bibliographer, who is responsible for the selection of materials offered according to Duke's profile in the Library of Congress Special Foreign Currency Program and who recommends purchase of related materials not available through the program.

4) A cataloger (principally for Oriental language materials) who serves as the liaison between the faculty and the AUL for Collection Development in the acquisition of Chinese and Japanese titles in the vernacular.

5) A cataloger of Cyrillic materials who reviews all items received on a Slavic approval plan, as well as new gift and exchange receipts.

There are indications from the Study Committee's faculty survey, the interviews by committee members with administrative officials at Duke, and a survey conducted by the AUL for Public Services that the faculty are less active in recommending materials for purchase than in earlier years. All requests from faculty in the sciences, music, art, and the Divinity School are channelled through the appropriate librarian and then submitted to the Acquisitions Department. All other faculty requests are submitted to the AUL for Collection Development or to the Acquisitions Department. After the orders which were submitted by faculty and staff (excepting orders from the science and Divinity School libraries) have been searched and are ready to be released, they are routed to a Collection Development librarian who assigns the most appropriate fund, whether departmental, special miscellaneous, or endowed.

This system of funding faculty as well as staff orders by Collection Development personnel began with the 1983/84 fiscal year. Subject codes were increased so that a better accounting of library acquisitions by topic is possible. Many faculty orders are assigned one of the subject fund codes rather than the library appropriated departmental fund code so that the allocations to the departments, excluding the sciences, now have little meaning. The information in the requester field in the Technical Services Data Base of the acquisitions system permits staff to determine the total orders from each department. All expensive orders (over $250) are approved by a Collection Development librarian. Most of the very expensive sets (such as the American Periodical Series) are put on a fund for large purchases. Ordering out-of-print catalog items is coordinated by the AUL for Collection Development, who often purchases these titles with endowed or special funds.

Serials orders are processed in a manner similar to monographs except that the initiation of every standing order must be approved by the AUL for Collection Development. The Periodicals Committee (in existence since about 1970), which is presently composed of nine librarians and the Reference Department's Periodicals Assistant, recommends the initiation of all periodical subscriptions except those for the science libraries.

Selecting materials to be ordered and assigning fund codes are not the only responsibilities of the Collection Development staff. Other duties include the following: proposing, allocating, and monitoring the materials budget, including appropriated, endowed and special funds; preparing special reports related to price trends, expenditures, etc. for the University Librarian and others; dealing with potential donors; reviewing exchange arrangements; approving all withdrawals and transfers; coordinating collection development activities within the Perkins system by working with all library departments, area bibliographers, branch librarians, and faculty; communicating with librarians in Fuqua, Law, Medical Center, and UNC-CH and NCSU; making location and disposition decisions for gifts, monographic series titles, standing order press titles, and old backlog items; organizing and following through with the Periodicals Review Project, as well as handling new periodical subscriptions through the Periodicals Committee and the science librarians; and collecting information for written collection development policies.

Objectives and Goals

In thinking about what needs to be done in the area of collection development during the next few years, the Collection Analysis Project Study Committee has attempted to formulate a statement of collection development objectives and goals in the context of what it sees as the library's mission and objectives with respect to collection development. Every library operates with a framework of values and priorities that guide collection development decisions, but it is not always a simple matter to determine exactly what those values and priorities are or should be. The mission, objectives, and goals outlined below are not official library policy but rather are offered by the committee as an aid to the work of the task forces and for comment and criticism by members of the university community.

Library Mission

The mission of the Duke University Libraries is to provide scholarly and informational resources and services that meet the needs of the university's research and instructional programs and that support the university's commitment to advancing the frontiers of learning and scholarship.

Library Objectives with respect to Collection Development

1. Identify and acquire informational resources in all forms needed to support undergraduate and graduate curricula.
2. Identify and acquire informational resources in all forms needed to support research by faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, and staff.
3. Identify and acquire a broad range of informational resources in subject areas pertinent to the university's research and instructional programs so that the library can support new curricular and research interests as they emerge.
4. Identify and acquire informational resources that build on existing collection strengths where these strengths are pertinent to the university's research and instructional programs and contribute to the advancement of scholarship on a national or international level.
5. Identify and acquire informational resources that support formally established inter-institutional cooperative agreements.

Collection Development Objectives and Goals

1. Develop written collection policy statements for the Perkins Library system which relate collection development activity to academic programs and to the broader collection responsibilities.
    a. Formulate models for collection policies and procedures for their adoption.
    b. Identify the level of support needed for on-going and emerging academic programs, including interdisciplinary studies.
    c. Identify areas deserving special support in the Perkins Library system, including existing collection strengths, special collections, and areas of responsibility in formal inter-institutional cooperative agreements.
2. Allocate resources in a manner that will implement the collection policy statements.
    a. Determine the criteria by which materials funds can most effectively be allocated.
    b. Review and revise book-budget allocations annually.
    c. Review and control serial standing orders.
3. Select materials in all formats in accordance with the collection policy statements.
    a. Develop liaisons with faculty members so that selection will reflect their research and instructional needs.
    b. Working with academic departments and the university administration, develop a process for assessing the impact on the library of proposed academic program changes and identify sources of information concerning new academic programs and research interests.
    c. Review gift collections for retention and disposition.
    d. Review current exchange arrangements and investigate new ones in order to acquire needed resources by the best means possible.
4. Assess the collection in a systematic way and periodically so that the collection as a whole as well as particular segments of it, such as newspapers and foreign documents, can be measured against the collection policy statements.
    a. Devise and implement methods to assess the use of materials not recorded at the circulation desk (e.g., current periodicals, newspapers).
    b. Identify and implement appropriate techniques for assessing various subject areas and segments of the collection.
    c. Assess the effectiveness of approval plans, blanket orders, and similar acquisitions programs.
5. Develop a preservation program that will assure the retention in some form of materials essential to the collection.
    a. Monitor existing collections and incoming materials to identify preservation needs.
    b. Develop a systematic process for replacing worn-out and lost materials that warrant replacement.
6. Identify the informational needs of the Collection Development Office with respect to other library departments and offices and the library's automated systems and develop procedures to ensure that Collection Development staff receives this information.
7. Define and implement a staffing structure suitable for carrying out collection development objectives and goals.

In sum, the Study Committee believes that the library needs to review and reshape its policies and procedures with respect to collection development so that collection growth is closely linked with university programs and materials funds are utilized as effectively as possible. The collection development objectives and goals outlined above indicate in more detail what we think needs to be done. The work of the task forces will relate to many of these objectives and goals, fulfilling some and laying the groundwork for others. One question the task forces and the committee must address is whether the library and the university will need to commit additional staff to collection development operations in order to carry through with these objectives and goals. At the same time, as one might infer from much that has been said in this report, we believe that the university may need to commit more resources, whether in allocated funds or in endowment income, to the acquisition of library materials if the Perkins Library system is to fulfill its role in the university's drive for excellence as a research institution. The university must provide adequate resources for collection development, and the library must utilize these resources effectively and efficiently.

NOTES

1. Duke University, The Fifth Decade (Durham, 1964), p. 23. Quoted in Duke University Central Report of the Institutional Self-Study for the Commission on Colleges and Universities, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (Durham, 1965), p. III-1.

2. Duke University Library Annual Report, 1950/51, p. 3.

3. The Library of Duke University (Durham: Friends of Duke University Library, 1949), p. 5. Further information on early years of the Duke Library can be obtained from Joseph Penn Breedlove's Duke University Library, 1840-1940 (Durham: Friends of Duke University Library, 1955); annual reports of the University Librarian beginning in 1928/29; and Benjamin E. Powell's "Duke University Library" in the Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science, 7:314-323.

4. College and University Library Statistics, 1919/20 to 1943/44, compiled from figures furnished by the participating libraries with an analysis by Margaret C. Shields (Princeton: Princeton University Libraries, 1947).

5. Information relating to cooperation among the three libraries can be found in the files of the Collection Development Office and in the following sources: Nancy Prothro Norton, "Cooperation in Collection Development between Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill" (Master's paper for the M.S.L.S. degree, School of Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, August 1978); Jerrold Orne and B.E. Powell, "The Libraries of the University of North Carolina and of Duke University," Library Trends 15 (October 1966): 222-247.

TASK FORCE ON ALLOCATION OF MATERIALS FUNDS

FOCUS: The criteria and process by which book budget monies are allocated in the Perkins Library system.

CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE:

1. Review, document, and analyze the present procedures for allocation of materials funds within the Perkins Library system. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the present procedures.

2. Review and analyze alternative methods for allocation of funds.

3. Determine what factors should be used to allocate funds in the Perkins Library system. Factors to be considered include graduate and undergraduate enrollment; university programs; numbers of faculty in various disciplines; faculty research interests in various fields; library use in various subject fields; historical collection strengths; cooperative agreements; nature of literature in various fields (importance of serials; citation patterns; importance of retrospective collecting); publishing patterns in various disciplines and in general; cost of materials in various fields and in general; new formats available; and new technologies in publishing. Identify the information needed for fund allocation and specify methods for obtaining the information.

4. Formulate recommendations for improving the allocation process. The recommendations should provide for logical distribution of funds relating collection development to the library's and the university's goals; provide for periodic review and revision of allocations; permit monitoring of allocated resources; and recognize financial constraints facing the library. Study the probable consequences of the recommendations in terms of impact on the budget, on library staff, on library-user relations, and on availability of needed materials.

RESULT: Prepare and submit to the Study Committee by June 15, 1984, a written report covering the tasks assigned above.

TASK FORCE ON ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

FOCUS: Procedures for ongoing evaluation of the state of the collections and their effectiveness in meeting the needs of the Duke community.

CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE:

1. Review quantitative and qualitative measures of collection effectiveness and evaluate their appropriateness to the Perkins Library system.
2. Conduct analyses to test collection-oriented assessment techniques. Select, as pilot projects, small subject areas within the sciences, social sciences, and the humanities (preferably one or two in each) to be evaluated. Selection should be of areas where the library is supporting doctoral research. Subject areas chosen may be areas which have undergone changes or where problems may exist.
3. Consider the need for user-oriented assessments as a tool for relating the collection to the actual needs of users in terms of availability of desired materials, accessibility of materials, utilization of the collections, and relative satisfaction of user needs. Recommend methodologies for conducting such assessments.
4. Develop a long-range plan for the assessment of subject areas or segments of the collection such as newspapers and establish priorities for carrying out the assessments.

RESULT: Prepare and submit to the Study Committee by June 15, 1984, a written report covering the tasks assigned above.

TASK FORCE ON COLLECTION POLICIES

FOCUS: Priorities, procedures, and formats for the development of collection policy statements for libraries in the Perkins Library system.

CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE:

1. Assess the written and unwritten collection development principles and policies under which the staff are presently operating.

2. Develop model(s) to be used for collection policies within the Perkins system. Determine the best factors by which to structure the policies. Consider the following as possibilities: academic programs, subject areas, classification, and formats of library materials. Consider also the appropriate descriptors (e.g., collecting level codes, language, geographic coverage). Keep in mind the need for compatibility of Duke policies with those of other institutions for regional and national cooperation.

3. Establish priorities for an ongoing process of policy development, based on program growth and client needs, level of staffing, and realistic appraisal of changing budgetary situations.

4. Determine who should be responsible for writing policies and recommend a procedure for adoption of policies.

5. Recommend a procedure for monitoring and periodic review of policies to reflect changing research and teaching needs.

RESULT: Prepare and submit to the Study Committee by June 15, 1984, a written report covering the tasks assigned above.

TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

FOCUS: Organization, staffing, and operating practices for effective collection management in the Perkins Library system.

CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE:

1. Review, document, and analyze the current operating practices of the collection development function with particular attention to the following:
   a. The organization and staffing of the Collection Development Office, including the roles and responsibilities of staff at all levels.
   b. The methods used and persons involved in the selection process, including the role of faculty and of librarians from branch libraries and from public and technical services.
   c. The relationship between Collection Development and other departments of the library, including the Library Systems Office, Acquisitions, and Serials. Consider specific responsibilities as well as coordination of efforts.
   d. The availability and use of information needed in support of collection development activities, including holdings information, accounting information, and statistical data. Consider the role of automated systems in providing such information.
   e. The role of gifts and exchanges in building the library's collections.
   f Communication between the Collection Development Office and the rest of the library, the Duke community, and the Triangle universities concerning factors that affect collection development.
   g. The responsibility for maintenance of the present collections through preservation of materials, weeding, replacement of lost materials, and the use of microforms for preservation and storage.
2. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current collection development structure and practices.
3. Formulate recommendations for improving the organization, staffing, and operating practices of collection development. Note the impact of the recommendations on library staffing and budgeting.

RESULT: Prepare and submit to the Study Committee by June 15, 1984, a written report covering the tasks assigned above.

Table 1
ARL Rankings of Duke University Libraries by Volumes Held, Volumes Added, and Materials Expenditures

Year	Volumes Held	ARL Rank	Volumes Added	ARL Rank	Materials Expenditures($)	ARL Rank	% of Total Library Budget Spent on Materials
1930/31	246,280	n/a	55,380	n/a	171,106	n/a	65.8
1935/36	452,444	n/a	32,180	n/a	141,977	n/a	85.1
1940/41	631,049	n/a	31,728	n/a	119,412	n/a	42.7
1945/46	740,493	16th	18,902	n/a	116,768	n/a	n/a
1950/51	1,038,898	14th	45,643	n/a	166,679	n/a	39.3
1955/56	1,244,880	13th	47,748	n/a	224,963	n/a	40.3
1960/61	1,493,022	14th	60,455	n/a	362,820	n/a	41.4
1965/66	1,783,803	18th	66,948	n/a	611,870	30th	37.9
1970/71	2,231,519	20th	99,485	33rd	1,133,638	31st	38.3
1971/72	2,333,382	20th	100,992	27th	1,153,474	30th	36.6
1972/73	2,483,962	20th	150,580	26th	1,196,106	33rd	35.7
1973/74	2,530,124	19th	91,162	32nd	1,190,997	38th	34.2
1974/75	2,622,167	19th	92,043	30th	1,472,993	28th	36.4
1975/76	2,764,348	18th	140,059	12th	1,469,653	34th	32.8
1976/77	2,869,558	19th	105,210	22nd	1,537,566	34th	30.9
1977/78	2,944,733	19th	75,175	40th	1,742,943	32nd	32.1
1978/79	3,022,839	19th	78,106	38th	1,924,753	32nd	34.9
1979/80	3,085,654	19th	62,815	50th	2,081,815	32nd	33.3
1980/81	3,006,026	19th	53,920	54th	2,331,104	35th	32.8
1981/82	3,182,642	19th	75,062	29th	2,386,664	31st	29.6
1982/83	3,261,222	19th	84,246	33rd	2,870,538	30th	37.2

Source: ARL Statistics; Statistics for College and University Libraries collected by Princeton University Library; Library Annual Reports.

Notes: Duke University Libraries include the Perkins, Law, Medical Center, and Fuqua systems. Volume added figures are based on volumes processed, not on volumes acquired.

Table 2

Enrollment

TC=Trinity College; WC=Woman's College; E=School of Engineering; G=Graduate School; L=School of Law; M=School of Medicine; N=School of Nursing; FB=Fuqua School of Business; D=Divinity School; FE=School of Forestry.

Years	TC	WC	E	G	L	M	N	FB	D	FE	Total
1924/25	1097			41	24						1162
1929/30	1751			418	50				112		2331
1934/35	1672	782		1016	103	257	90		122		4042
1939/40	1590	880	215	1230	123	345	92		104	20	4599
1944/45	4049	982		371	31	376	260		154	2	6225
1949/50	2341	1166	280	726	280	301	131		185	69	5479
1954/55	1803	1074	445	412	118						
1959/60	1865	1209	495	693	177		297				
1964/65	2082	1237	391	1274	302		274		250	73	
1970	4668			2309							
1975	5352			2803							
1977	4886		724	1728	532	497	400	197	390	88	9442
1978	4978		761	1820	552	497	368	268	410	107	9761
1979	4947		799	1693	528	499	351	310	393	123	9643
1980	4934		812	1641	546	486	341	345	384	117	9606
1981	5099		865	1662	563	490	236	423	373	126	9837
1982	5156		873	1651	572	493	143	491	385	104	9868

Source: Duke University annual bulletins for years prior to 1977; for subsequent years, Annual Statistical Report of the Office of the Registrar.

Notes: Not all figures are available for all years. Trinity College figures for 1944/45 include School of Engineering enrollment. Figures for School of Nursing include graduate as well as undergraduate enrollment.

Table 3

Departments and Degree Programs

Department	Major	A.M.	M.S.	Ph.D
Afro-American Studies	X			
Anatomy				X
Anthropology	X	X		X
Art	X	X		
Biochemistry				X
Biomedical Engineering	X		X	X
Botany	X		X	X
Business Administration		M.B.A.		
Cell & Molecular Biology				X
Chemistry	X		X	X
Civil Engineering	X		X	X
Classical Studies	X			X
Comparative Literature	X			
Computer Science	X		X	X
Drama	X			
Economics	X	X		X
Education				X
Electrical Engineering	X		X	X
English	X	X		X
Forestry		X	X	X
Geology	X		X	X
Germanic Lang. & Lit.	X	X		
Health Administration		M.H.A.		
History	X	X		X
Mathematics	X	X	X	X
Mechanical Engineering	X		X	X
Microbiology & Immunology				X
Music	X	X		X
Neurobiology				X
Pathology				X
Pharmacology				X
Philosophy	X	X		X
Physical Therapy			X	
Physics	X	X		X
Physiology				X
Political Science	X	X		X
Psychology	X			X
Public Policy	X	X		
Religion	X	X		X
Romance Lang. & Lit.	X	X		X
Slavic Lang. & Lit.	X			
Sociology	X			X
Toxicology				X
Zoology	X		X	X

Table 4

Special Programs

Program	Degree or Level
Asian-Pacific Studies Institute	Graduate level
Canadian Studies	Graduate and undergraduate
Center for Demographic Studies	Advanced degrees
Center for Environmental Engineering	Graduate and undergraduate
Center for International Studies	Graduate and undergraduate
Center for Research and Environmental Policy Research	Graduate
Center for the Study of Aging and Human Development	Graduate, undergraduate, post-doctoral
Center for the Study of Family and the State	
Indian Ocean Studies Program	Graduate
Institute of the Arts	Undergraduate, no degree
Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs	Graduate, A.M. only
Islamic and Arabian Development Studies	Graduate, undergraduate
Latin American Studies	Graduate
Marine Sciences	Graduate, undergraduate
Master of Arts Program in Humanities	Graduate
Medical Historian Training Program	M.D.-Ph.D., M.D.-A.M.
Medical Scientist Training Program	M.D.-Ph.D.
Oak Ridge Associated Universities	Graduate
Organization for Tropical Studies	
Perspectives in Marxism	Undergraduate
Ph.D. Program in Literature	Graduate
Program in Medieval and Renaissance Studies	Graduate
Science, Technology and Human Values	Undergraduate
University Program in Cell and Molecular Biology	Graduate
University Program in Genetics	Graduate
University Program in Toxicology	Graduate
Women's Studies Program	Undergraduate

Source: *Bulletin of Duke University: Graduate School, 1983-84*.

Table 5
Distribution of Undergraduates According to Major

Major	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Accounting	172	134	80	46	0
Afro-American Studies	-	-	-	1	1
Anthropology	64	49	39	41	33
Art	21	21	27	23	17
Art Design	11	6	8	5	13
Biology	-	3	101	151	189
Botany	101	76	52	33	17
Chemistry	256	275	268	226	228
Classical Studies	7	9	7	8	7
Comp. Area Studies	23	24	23	40	42
Comp. Lit.	10	10	12	17	9
Computer Science	61	79	141	188	237
Drama	10	10	9	6	6
Economics	342	351	433	446	479
Education	3 6	34	20	14	5
Engineering					
Biomedical	122	120	183	166	146
Civil	78	57	80	67	53
Electrical	102	89	121	117	167
Mechanical	150	169	229	180	162
English	200	180	173	156	171
French	46	42	27	28	36
General & Undecided	1804	2104	1936	2239	2306
Geology	46	38	45	48	53
German	15	10	5	8	6
Greek	4	5	3	1	0
History	318	263	290	303	280
Latin	3	3	1	3	3
Management Science	288	247	152	74	3
Mathematics	53	48	54	48	57
Medieval Studies	1	2	6	8	6
Music	24	14	13	22	18
Nursing	349	330	321	214	124
Philosophy	31	31	24	27	27
Physics	36	31	39	38	37
Political Science	298	289	317	384	402
Psychology	350	308	301	341	344
Public Policy	176	191	194	194	177
Religion	83	82	72	63	67
Russian	6	10	7	10	5
Science Education	1	2	2	1	1
Sociology	42	38	36	26	25
Spanish	18	14	14	13	18
Zoology	326	278	202	154	164

Source: Annual Statistical Report. Office of the Registrar, Duke University, 1977/78-1982/83.

Note: Figures are for the fall semesters of the years indicated.

Table 6
Bachelors Degrees by Major

Major	77/78	78/79	79/80	80/81	81/82	82/83
Accounting	63	78	68	46	51	4
Afro-American Studies	1	-	-	-	-	-
Anthropology	20	21	26	12	18	15
Art	5	8	9	8	11	6
Art Design	4	4	6	5	2	3
Biology	-	-	1	9	38	52
Botany	30	50	29	23	13	6
Chemistry	91	79	79	91	76	74
Classical Studies	1	2	-	4	1	3
Comp. Area Studies	8	9	7	7	13	15
Comp. Lit.	5	4	6	3	9	5
Computer Science	16	22	24	42	65	89
Drama	3	4	6	3	9	4
Economics	140	124	130	139	157	186
Education	10	12	14	8	6	4
Engineering						
Biomedical	44	38	43	38	59	49
Civil	20	31	30	23	20	22
Electrical	32	44	34	42	34	54
Mechanical	44	37	68	83	81	68
English	74	60	77	64	55	63
Forestry	1	-	-	-	-	-
French	17	15	22	11	5	12
Geology	13	13	15	21	7	18
German	5	10	7	3	3	1
Greek	-	1	2	2	1	-
History	123	128	128	89	115	133
Latin	-	1	2	1	-	1
Management Sciences	63	87	94	62	62	7
Mathematics	17	20	11	10	18	21
Medieval Studies	1	-	1	1	3	4
Music	15	10	8	8	4	2
Philosophy	8	11	13	7	8	11
Physics	8	14	10	9	11	11
Political Science	72	98	116	105	114	139
Program II	-	-	-	12	2	7
Psychology	106	135	127	109	126	142
Public Policy	63	51	66	53	67	68
Religion	46	24	33	26	28	34
Russian	5	4	5	3	4	3
Science Education	2	1	-	2	-	1
Sociology	23	19	17	12	10	16
Spanish	2	5	3	8	2	5
Zoology	108	112	109	88	59	60

Source: Annual Statistical Report. Office of the Registrar, Duke University, 1977/78-1982/83.

Note: Figures for each academic year include degrees granted in September, December, and May.

Table 7
Distribution of Graduate Students According to Major

Major	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Anatomy	14	19	18	19	21	17
Anthropology	17	20	15	23	22	19
Art	3	2	2	1	-	-
Biochemistry	60	60	61	63	63	62
Botany	48	60	61	61	61	56
Business Administration	2	-	1	2	4	5
Chemistry	79	83	84	85	82	94
Classical Studies	15	13	12	13	14	14
Computer Science	26	25	30	36	41	55
Economics	65	66	61	68	64	76
Education	226	286	237	191	140	83
Engineering						
Biomedical	26	26	24	28	26	28
Civil	27	25	27	37	37	38
Electrical	21	24	27	29	41	54
Mechanical	19	17	16	12	19	24
English	114	108	96	86	88	86
Forestry	28	31	36	29	30	44
French	2	5	2	3	2	2
Geology	30	29	25	23	33	30
German	7	7	7	6	7	4
Health Administration	132	121	90	76	78	80
History	83	105	99	97	90	86
Mathematics	25	24	19	21	26	26
Microbiology	58	57	59	57	61	56
Music	-	-	-	-	4	8
Pathology	19	27	26	25	28	23
Pharmacology	27	28	25	25	27	31
Philosophy	20	21	20	20	18	18
Physical Therapy	45	46	44	48	48	50
Physics	36	44	43	46	47	46
Physiology	38	37	42	33	29	26
Political Science	43	48	41	44	43	49
Psychology	92	97	93	85	76	69
Public Policy	18	27	36	42	46	54
Religion	82	83	80	84	88	92
Romance Languages	23	21	16	11	11	11
Sociology	51	55	49	48	37	34
Spanish	1	3	1	-	-	-
Zoology	58	69	67	70	75	70
Unclassified	11	-	-	-	35	31

Source: Annual Statistical Report. Office of the Registrar, Duke University, 1977/78-1982/83.

Note: Figures are for the fall semester of each year.

Table 8
Graduate Degrees by Major

Major	77/78	78/79	79/80	80/81	81/82	82/83
Anatomy	3	5	1	3	5	4
Anthropology	2	2	2	7	1	5
Art	-	-	-	-	1	-
Biochemistry	6	9	6	5	5	9
Botany	8	6	7	9	15	15
Business Administration	64	73	132	139	162	226
Chemistry	17	15	19	19	20	14
Classical Studies	5	2	-	2	1	2
Computer Science	13	4	8	10	7	11
Economics	18	15	17	21	14	27
Education	77	57	75	43	56	35
Engineering						
Biomedical	5	7	4	11	10	4
Civil	10	6	8	11	15	9
Electrical	6	8	10	8	9	10
Mechanical	5	5	7	5	2	11
English	15	25	27	23	17	13
Forestry	48	37	53	58	52	43
Geology	11	8	11	-	8	6
German	2	3	2	3	2	2
Health Administration	59	62	52	39	36	43
History	15	31	19	20	21	16
Management Science	17	-	2	-	-	-
Mathematics	10	6	9	5	9	5
Microbiology	5	4	9	10	13	20
Music	-	-	-	-	-	3
Nursing	33	19	21	20	22	10
Pathology	1	5	7	7	6	6
Pharmacology	3	2	4	11	1	4
Philosophy	2	1	4	1	2	1
Physics	6	9	5	16	11	13
Physiology	8	3	10	6	8	6
Political Science	8	7	11	13	9	3
Psychology	18	14	20	30	25	21
Public Policy	5	13	6	11	18	7
Religion	11	11	13	9	8	13
Romance Languages	3	8	10	3	3	1
Sociology	10	11	13	10	13	9
Zoology	9	11	9	8	12	12

Source: Annual Statistical Report. Office of the Registrar, Duke University, 1977/78–1982/83.

Note: Figures for each academic year include degrees granted in September, December, and May.

Table 9
Number of Faculty

Year	Total Number of Faculty
1924/25	128
1929/30	262
1934/35	337
1939/40	446
1944/45	511
1949/50	548
1954/55	560
1959/60	947
1964/65	964
1970	984
1975	1161
1980	1415
1981	1451
1982	1442
1983	1452

Source: Figures prior to 1980 are from Duke University annual bulletins and include faculty from all schools. Figures from 1980 and subsequent years are from the Office of the Secretary.

Note: Figures include professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, instructional assistants, lecturers, visiting professors, and adjunct professors except that figures for 1980 and subsequent years do not include adjunct or clinical professors.

Table 10
Number of Faculty by Departments

Department	Undergraduate	Graduate
Anatomy	-	26
Anthropology	14	14
Art	8	5
Biochemistry	-	30
Botany	18	18
Business Administration	-	40
Chemistry	22	20
Classical Studies	9	9
Computer Science	17	15
Economics	28	24
Education	11	11
Engineering		
Biomedical	11	11
Civil	13	12
Electrical	15	14
Mechanical	15	14
English	28	21
Forestry	-	17
Geology	5	5
Germanic Lang. & Lit.	6	6
Health Administration	-	8
History	34	32
Mathematics	23	23
Music	13	6
Pathology	-	29
Pharmacology	-	22
Philosophy	9	9
Physics	21	20
Physiology	-	34
Political Science	23	23
Psychology	27	27
Religion	18	28
Romance Lang. & Lit.	17	12
Slavic Lang. & Lit.	2	2
Sociology	16	16
Zoology	24	24
TOTAL	447	627

Source: Bulletin of Duke University, Undergraduate Instruction and Graduate School, 1983/84.

Notes: Figures include only full-time faculty in three regular ranks, Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor. Since some faculty hold joint appointments in more than one department, totals will be higher than number of faculty.

Table 11
Faculty Assessment of Library Collection

Department (number of respondents)	Average Teaching Support	Average Research Support
Anthropology (6)	7.6	5.7
Art (3)	7.3	7.0
Botany (6)	7.9	7.4
Chemistry (11)	9.5	8.4
Classical Studies (6)	7.3	6.4
Computer Science (4)	7.4	6.1
Divinity School (5)	9.0	9.2
Economics (6)	8.7	8.5
Education (2)	9.3	8.3
Engineering		
Biomedical (3)	5.0	6.0
Civil (3)	7.5	6.0
Mechanical (4)	9.0	8.0
English (12)	8.5	7.9
Forestry & Environmental Studies (4)	8.4	8.4
German (4)	6.1	6.4
History (17)	7.9	7.4
Mathematics (10)	8.7	8.9
Military Sciences (2)	9.5	7.5
Miscellaneous (12)	8.4	7.2
Music (3)	7.8	3.2
Philosophy (4)	9.3	7.5
Physics (4)	7.3	7.3
Political Science (4)	8.3	7.3
Psychology (9)	8.3	7.0
Religion (4)	8.5	7.8
Romance Languages (8)	8.0	7.1
Sociology (4)	7.5	7.5
Zoology (11)	8.1	7.5
Overall Average (171)	8.6	7.3

Source: Faculty survey conducted by Collection Analysis Project Study Committee.

Note: Teaching and research support were ranked on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being totally inadequate and 10 totally adequate.

Table 12

Comparison of Total University Expenditures, Educational and General Expenditures, and Library Expenditures, 1977/78-1982/83

Year	University Expenditures	% of Change	Educational and General Expenditures	% of Change	Library Expenditures	% of Change	Library % of Educational and General Expenditures	Library % of Total Univ. Expenditures
1977/78	231,226,684		118,640,262		5,290,858		4.5	2.3
1978/79	248,301,329	7.3	128,711,946	8.5	5,881,065	11.0	4.5	2.3
1979/80	289,274,807	16.5	144,912,662	12.6	6,400,695	8.8	4.4	2.2
1980/81	349,955,928	21.0	164,219,456	13.3	7,003,023	9.4	4.3	2.0
1981/82	395,657,611	13.0	187,641,420	14.3	7,738,413	10.5	4.1	2.0
1982/83	421,303,000	11.5	203,699,000	8.5	8,650,000	11.8	4.2	2.0

Source: Duke University Financial Reports, 1977/78-1982/83

Note: Total Library Expenditure includes expenses of the Perkins System, the Medical Center Library, the Law Library, and in 1982/83 the Fuqua School of Business Library. Non-university funds are included.

Table 13

Annual Budget Appropriations of University Funds for Library Materials, 1970/71-1983/84

Year	Perkins and Branch libraries ($)	Divinity School Monographs ($)	Total ($)	% of Change
1970/71	507,500	24,000	531,500	
1971/72	574,000	24,600	598,600	12.6
1972/73	620,500	26,000	646,500	8.0
1973/74	683,100	27,770	710,870	9.9
1974/75	740,179	31,000	771,179	8.4
1975/76	822,200	34,000	856,200	11.0
1976/77	895,000	38,000	933,000	8.9
1977/78	983,500	41,400	1,024,900	9.8
1978/79	1,082,950	45,000	1,127,950	10.0
1979/80	1,195,890	49,850	1,245,740	10.7
1980/81	1,315,520	56,580	1,372,100	10.1
1981/82	1,405,113	63,370	1,468,483	7.0
1982/83	1,612,282	64,130	1,676,412	14.1
1983/84	1,711,837	69,902	1,781,739	6.2

average = 9.7%

Source: Collection Development Office Files

Note: The university makes a separate appropriation for Divinity School monographs.

Table 14

Perkins System Materials Expenditures (in dollars) According to Source of Funds

Year	Appropri-ated Funds	% of Change	% of Total	Endowed Funds	% of Total	Grants and Gifts	% of Total	Total Endowed Funds, Grants, Gifts	% of Change	% of Total	Total Expenditure	% of Change
70/71	582,702		63.2	n/a		n/a		339,004		36.8	921,706	
71/72	609,217	4.6	67.7	n/a		n/a		291,290	-14.0	32.3	900,507	-2.3
72/73	661,229	12.9	71.3	n/a		n/a		266,441	- 8.5	28.7	927,670	3.0
73/74	746,976	12.9	85.1	n/a		n/a		130,443	-51.0	14.9	877,419	-5.4
74/75	785,086	5.1	73.0	n/a		n/a		290,924	123.0	27.0	1,076,010	29.6
75/76	890,467	13.4	86.6	n/a		n/a		137,763	-52.6	13.4	1,028,230	-4.4
76/77	974,955	9.4	89.0	n/a		n/a		120,564	-12.4	11.0	1,095,519	6.5
77/78	1,036,956	6.4	86.3	n/a		n/a		165,009	36.8	13.7	1,201,965	9.7
78/79	1,144,660	10.4	84.7	n/a		n/a		206,337	25.0	15.3	1,350,997	12.4
79/80	1,259,513	10.0	87.9	116,670	8.1	57,102	4.0	173,772	-15.0	12.1	1,433,285	6.0
80/81	1,400,169	11.2	85.0	103,102	6.2	145,510	8.8	248,612	43.0	15.0	1,648,781	15.0
81/82	1,475,494	5.3	89.3	134,582	8.1	43,114	2.6	177,696	-28.5	10.7	1,653,190	0.2
82/83	1,741,351	18.0	90.1	163,052	8.4	27,721	1.4	190,773	7.3	9.9	1,932,124	16.8

Source: Collection Development Office Files.

Table 15

Materials Expenditures: Comparison of the Perkins System, Law, Medical Center, and Fuqua Libraries

Year	Perkins System	% of Total	Law Library	% of Total	Medical Center Library	% of Total	Fuqua Business Library	% of Total	Total
1940/41	99,811	83	15,085	13	4,514	4			119,411
1950/51	142,922	84	16,966	10	10,823	6			170,711
1960/61	310,451	85	32,461	9	19,902	6			362,814
1970/71	921,706	81	92,901	8	119,027	10			1,133,634
1971/72	900,510	78	95,810	8	157,154	14			1,153,474
1972/73	927,671	77	107,999	9	160,436	13			1,196,104
1973/74	877,419	73	130,874	11	182,704	15			1,190,996
1974/75	1,076,010	74	172,701	12	224,280	15			1,472,991
1975/76	1,028,235	70	170,071	11	271,347	18			1,469,653
1976/77	1,095,522	70	196,179	12	269,694	17			1,561,395
1977/78	1,201,965	69	225,256	13	315,718	18			1,742,939
1978/79	1,350,997	70	246,642	13	327,113	17			1,924,752
1979/80	1,433,285	69	264,744	13	383,785	18			2,081,815
1980/81	1,648,781	71	315,836	13	366,487	16			2,331,104
1981/82	1,653,190	69	324,866	14	408,608	17			2,386,664
1982/83	1,932,124	66	411,866	14	451,565	16	112,124	4	2,907,679

Source: Library annual reports.

Table 16

United States Hardbound Book Prices

	All		Art		History		Music		Science		Technology	
	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change
1970	11.66		16.16		14.75		11.44		14.95		14.91	
1971	13.25	13.6	16.41	1.5	12.97	-12.1	11.73	2.5	15.94	6.6	15.28	2.5
1972	12.99	-2.0	14.94	-9.0	14.92	15.0	13.53	15.3	16.05	.6	16.11	5.4
1973	12.20	-6.1	15.42	3.2	15.56	4.3	12.68	-6.3	17.34	8.0	15.38	-4.6
1974	14.09	15.5	14.46	-6.3	15.69	.8	14.43	13.8	20.83	20.1	17.74	15.3
1975	16.19	14.9	17.90	23.7	15.85	1.0	14.83	2.8	22.81	9.5	19.66	10.8
1976	17.39	7.4	20.29	13.4	16.74	5.6	16.38	10.5	24.42	7.1	21.19	7.8
1977	19.22	10.5	21.24	4.7	17.12	2.3	20.12	22.8	24.88	1.9	23.61	11.4
1978	19.30	0.4	21.11	-.7	17.20	.5	24.68	22.7	26.20	5.3	22.64	-4.2
1979	23.96	24.1	21.45	1.7	19.79	15.1	18.93	-23.3	30.59	16.8	27.82	22.9
1980	24.64	2.8	27.70	29.1	22.78	15.1	21.79	15.1	37.45	22.4	33.64	20.9
1981	26.63	8.1	31.87	15.0	23.15	1.6	25.82	18.5	40.63	7.4	36.76	9.3
1982	30.59	14.9	31.62	-.8	26.99	16.6	26.83	3.9	43.38	6.8	40.48	10.1
average annual increase (%)		8.7		6.3		4.2		8.2		9.4		9.0
cumulative increase (%)		162.3		95.6		108.1		134.5		190.2		171.5

Source: Bowker Annual

Note: Column for all subjects reflects inclusion of additional subjects besides those selected for display in this table.

Table 17

United States Periodical Prices

	All Subjects		Chemistry & Physics		Fine Arts		History		Engineering		Philosophy & Religion		Zoology	
	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change	avg.$ price	% change
970	10.41		33.45		7.50		6.90		12.07		5.84		16.86	
971	11.66	9.9	38.31	14.5	8.17	8.7	7.40	7.2	13.28	10.0	6.71	14.9	19.29	14.4
972	13.23	13.5	45.46	18.7	8.42	3.1	8.25	11.5	16.04	20.9	7.16	6.7	22.39	16.1
973	16.20	22.4	56.61	24.5	9.16	8.8	8.95	8.5	23.37	45.7	8.12	13.4	24.07	7.5
974	17.71	9.3	65.47	15.7	9.84	7.4	9.57	6.9	24.38	4.3	8.84	8.9	24.78	2.9
975	19.94	12.6	76.84	17.4	11.09	12.7	11.14	6.4	26.64	9.7	9.05	2.4	27.37	10.5
976	22.52	12.9	86.72	12.9	12.42	12.0	11.94	7.2	31.87	19.6	9.94	9.8	31.34	14.5
977	24.59	9.2	93.76	8.1	13.72	10.5	12.64	5.9	35.77	12.2	10.89	9.6	33.69	7.5
978	27.58	12.2	108.22	15.4	14.82	8.0	13.71	8.5	39.77	11.2	11.66	7.0	37.05	9.8
979	30.37	10.1	118.33	9.3	17.42	17.5	14.67	7.0	42.95	8.0	13.25	13.6	40.15	8.4
980	34.54	13.7	137.45	16.2	18.67	7.2	15.77	7.5	49.15	14.4	14.73	11.2	44.58	11.0
981	39.13	13.3	156.30	13.7	20.51	9.9	17.96	13.9	54.55	11.0	15.40	4.5	48.32	8.4
982	44.80	14.5	177.94	13.8	23.35	13.8	20.37	13.4	61.54	12.8	17.92	16.4	61.07	26.4
983	50.23	12.1	207.94	16.9	25.17	7.8	22.43	10.1	73.18	18.9	20.21	12.8	70.74	15.8
verage annual ncrease (%)		12.7		15.2		9.8		9.4		15.3		10.1		11.8
umulative ncrease (%)		382.5		521.6		235.6		225.1		506.3		146.1		319.6

ource: Bowker Annual

ote: Column for all subjects reflects inclusion of additional subjects besides those selected for display in this table.

Table 18
Estimated Acquisitions by U.S. College and University Libraries of Books Published both Domestically and Abroad

Year	Expenditures for Books (in Millions of Dollars)	Number of Units (in Millions)	% Change Over Prior Year	
			Expenditures	Units
1977	209.2	21.45		
1978	234.1	22.18	11.9	3.4
1979	248.5	22.97	6.2	3.6
1980	269.4	24.90	8.4	5.7
1981	280.0	22.32	3.9	-10.4
1982	289.4	21.34	3.4	-4.4
	average change 78-82		5.5	-1.4
1983	300.4	20.61	3.8	-3.4
1984	314.0	20.07	4.5	-2.6
1985	329.9	19.71	5.1	-1.8
1986	349.3	19.67	5.9	-0.2
1987	368.1	19.54	5.4	-0.7
	average change 83-87		4.9	-1.7

Source: Book Industry Trends, 1983

Table 19

A Comparison of Selected Perkins Library Average Materials Costs with United States Average Material Prices

	United States Monographs						United States Periodicals			
	Yankee Book Peddler[1]		Bookhouse[2]		United States[3]		F.W. Faxon[4]		United States[5]	
	average cost ($)	% change	average cost ($)	% change	average list price ($)	% change	average cost ($)	% change	average list price ($)	% change
1981	22.95				18.19					
1982	23.42	2.0	26.05		21.14	16.2	54.74		44.80	
1983	24.07	2.8	25.99	-0.3			65.85	20.3	50.23	12.1
1984							63.66[6]	-3.4		

Notes:
1. Books received on a University Press standing order plan, all subjects, generally hardbound.
2. Books received in response to specific orders, includes all subjects, all formats, and both hard and paperbound books.
3. Combined average of hardbound and trade paperback book prices derived from the Bowker Annual.
4. Subscriptions to periodicals, generally domestic titles, all subjects.
5. Extracted from the Bowker Annual.
6. Estimated figures supplied by F.W. Faxon.

Table 20

Growth of Collections by Library: Perkins System

ar	PL	UGL	BF	CHEM	DML	DS	EC	EN	MP	MU	Total Perkins System
30/31	196,389						7,110				203,499
35/36	341,968						27,935				369,903
40/41	475,382						50,063				525,445
45/46	509,152					39,585	68,877				617,614
50/51	659,853		44,910	15,037		53,997	88,360	16,289	14,631		893,057
55/56	775,593		56,401	16,669		76,843	108,752	24,231	18,713		1,077,202
60/61	922,717		72,461	19,213	1,757	98,761	129,115	29,745	24,084		1,297,853
65/66	1,100,557		87,076	22,605	3,316	125,854	155,427	36,162	30,653		1,561,650
70/71	1,362,246	7,058	106,135	27,946	6,333	155,190	193,626	47,055	41,114		1,946,703
71/72	1,425,491	12,815	109,661	28,972	7,046	160,913	199,602	49,046	43,433		2,030,639
72/73	1,491,739	16,196	113,003	29,718	7,591	166,715	210,091	50,844	45,642		2,131,539
73/74	1,547,181	16,907	116,387	31,509	8,268	172,358	216,893	52,440	47,800		2,209,743
74/75	1,604,813	17,461	119,028	33,228	9,325	178,788	179,746	53,947	49,933	43,559	2,289,828
75/76	1,702,845	18,839	123,178	34,567	10,447	184,302	184,921	56,141	52,859	45,523	2,413,622
76/77	1,759,456	19,884	127,439	36,150	11,687	190,312	189,444	58,681	55,754	47,123	2,495,930
77/78	1,793,225	20,348	130,263	37,242	12,631	194,672	192,300	60,089	57,925	48,417	2,547,112
78/79	1,834,415	20,683	133,030	38,345	13,343	198,282	195,809	61,908	59,753	49,369	2,604,911
79/80	1,865,442	20,892	135,986	40,077	13,990	202,999	199,555	64,425	62,269	50,438	2,656,073
80/81	1,890,643	20,928	138,064	39,230	14,606	207,513	202,406	66,322	64,853	51,664	2,696,229
81/82	1,928,436	20,973	140,352	40,257	15,175	214,382	205,830	69,151	66,771	53,003	2,754,330
82/83	1,972,794	20,614	143,474	41,467	15,556	221,731	209,241	71,936	69,171	54,603	2,820,587

rce: Library annual reports.

e: Figures are for volumes rather than titles. PL=Perkins Library; UGL=Undergraduate Library; BF=Biology/Forestry Library; CHEM=Chemistry Library; DML=Duke Marine Laboratory Library; DS=Divinity School Library; EC=East Campus Library; EN=Engineering Library; MP=Math/Physics Library; MU=Music Library.

Table 21

Expenditures (in dollars) for Serials and Non-Serials: Perkins System[1]

Year	Expenditures for Non-Serials[3]	% Change	Expenditures for Serials[2]	% Change	Total[4]	% of Total Non-serials	% of Total Serials
1960/61	246,684		63,767		310,451	79.4	20.5
1965/66	354,775	43.8	132,673	108.0	487,448	72.7	27.2
1970/71	693,215	95.4	228,491	72.2	921,706	75.2	24.7
1971/72	619,068	-10.7	281,439	23.1	900,507	68.7	31.2
1972/73	601,425	-2.9	326,246	15.9	927,671	65.0	35.0
1973/74	472,389	-21.0	405,030	24.0	877,419	54.0	46.0
1974/75	596,641	26.0	479,369	18.0	1,076,010	55.0	45.0
1975/76	491,641	-17.6	536,590	11.9	1,028,231	48.0	52.0
1976/77	511,635	4.0	583,884	9.0	1,095,519	47.0	53.0
1977/78	618,029	21.0	583,936	.0	1,201,965	51.0	49.0
1978/79	650,055	5.0	700,943	20.0	1,350,998	48.0	52.0
1979/80	615,317	-5.3	817,968	17.0	1,433,285	43.0	57.0
1980/81	650,450	5.7	998,331	22.0	1,648,781	39.0	61.0
1981/82	677,706	4.0	975,484	-2.0	1,653,190	41.0	59.0
1982/83	908,915	34.0	1,023,209	4.9	1,932,124	47.0	53.0

Notes:
1. Figures are for Perkins, Biology-Forestry, Chemistry, Duke Marine Lab, Divinity School, East Campus, Engineering, Math-Physics, and Music Libraries. Expenditures include appropriated funds, endowment income, grants, and gifts.
2. Included in this expenditure are many new monographs received as titles in series.
3. Includes money spent for monographs, binding, postage, large on-going publishing projects, exchanges, and serials backfiles purchased with endowed funds.
4. Total materials expenditure & Serials expenditure figures are all taken from tabulations of appropriate figures on Expenditure and Statistics Reports.

Table 22
Book and Serial Expenditures by Library, 1980/81-1982/83

	Year	Books	% of Total for Specific Library	Serials	% of Total for Specific Library	Total Expenditure for Specific Library	% of Overall Materials Expenditure
Perkins	1980/81	436,646	52	403,717	48	840,363	51
	1981/82	354,879	47	396,576	53	751,455	45
	1982/83	545,325	58	391,931	42	937,256	49
Biology/ Forestry	1980/81	8,263	7	117,119	93	125,382	8
	1981/82	9,350	7	125,274	93	134,625	8
	1982/83	11,038	8	128,618	92	139,656	7
Chemistry	1980/81	5,750	4	133,395	96	139,145	8
	1981/82	9,233	6	139,713	94	148,946	9
	1982/83	10,337	7	145,146	93	155,483	8
Duke Marine	1980/81	1,488	5	27,809	95	29,297	2
	1981/82	2,404	7	30,720	93	33,124	2
	1982/83	1,187	3	38,535	97	39,722	2
Divinity School	1980/81	64,300	64	35,897	36	100,197	6
	1981/82	73,410	68	34,576	32	107,986	7
	1982/83	65,159	64	36,505	36	101,664	5
East Campus	1980/81	26,419	46	30,889	54	57,308	3
	1981/82	31,542	53	27,725	47	59,267	4
	1982/83	30,995	54	26,773	46	57,768	3
Engineering	1980/81	9,482	10	82,983	90	92,465	5
	1981/82	14,115	13	91,851	87	105,966	6
	1982/83	16,295	15	94,513	85	110,808	6
Math/ Physics	1980/81	8,491	8	98,587	92	107,078	6
	1981/82	12,636	12	94,725	88	107,361	6
	1982/83	13,588	11	107,185	89	120,773	6
Music	1980/81	15,080	59	10,443	41	25,523	2
	1981/82	4,738	30	11,029	70	15,767	1
	1982/83	40,552	78	11,183	22	51,735	3

Note: Perkins Library total book expenditure arrived at by deducting branch library book costs, all serial costs, binding, exchange, and postage costs from total Perkins System and Divinity School figure. Perkins figure includes expenditures for serials classified separately and exchanges, some of which go to branch libraries.

Appendix A
Faculty Survey Letter and Form

November 30, 1983

Memorandum

TO: Faculty of Arts and Sciences

FROM: Elvin Strowd, University Librarian

SUBJECT: Attached Survey

The Perkins Library is currently undertaking a self-study of collection development operations with guidance from the Management Studies staff of the Association of Research Libraries. The basic purpose of this Collection Analysis Project, as it is called, is to review within the present and future environment of the University current collection development policies and procedures and to recommend changes as appropriate to ensure efficient and effective use of the Library's and the University's resources.

The first stage of the study includes an analysis of environmental factors such as publishing trends, the University's instructional programs, faculty research interests, and University finances. Your response to the enclosed survey will help the study committee in its assessment of these factors. The survey is brief. It is designed simply to be folded and delivered through campus mail service. It should be completed and mailed no later than December 10, 1983.

The Collection Analysis Project study committee consists of Virginia Gilbert, Katherine Porter, Helen Reed, Jane Vogel, Jeri Van Goethem, and Robert Byrd, chairman. The committee will issue an interim report focusing on history and description of the collections and environmental analysis in February 1984. During the spring of 1984 three task forces, working with charges from the study committee, will address the following matters: (1) the development of collection policies and of procedures for assessing the collections; (2) the allocation of materials funds; and (3) the organization of collection development personnel and their roles vis-a-vis faculty and other librarians. The final report of the study committee, including the task force recommendations, will be issued by August 1984.

Members of the study committee would welcome your views with regard to any of the matters mentioned above at any time. Your completing and returning the enclosed survey by December 10 would be particularly appreciated.

ES:srw

enclosure

Please indicate your department and your current research interests. This information is essential for assessing data provided in the survey. Indicating your name is optional.

Name: ______________________________ Department: ____________________

Research interests: ____

I. We would like a general idea of your view of the adequacy of the library's collections in supporting your teaching and research.

1 = entirely inadequate; 10 = entirely adequate

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Adequacy of collections in support of your teaching

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Adequacy of collections in support of your research

II. Please indicate any major anticipated changes in your research interests for the upcoming year or two.

III. What new courses, if any, are you currently developing?

IV. Will the changes indicated in II and III require additional library resources?

V. What is your current involvement in recommending materials for purchase by the library?

Frequently recommend _____; Occasionally recommend _____; Never recommend _____

Comments:

VI. Do present arrangements for selection of library materials meet your needs? If not, in what ways are they unsatisfactory?

Thank you for your assistance.

FOLD HERE FOLD HERE

CAMPUS MAIL

TO: Collection Analysis Project
220 Perkins Library
Duke University

STAPLE HERE (optional)

Appendix B
Summary of Findings of Faculty Survey

Department: ANTHROPOLOGY (6)

—Average Teaching Support: 7.6 (10-point scale)
—Average Research Support: 5.7

—New research interests: Taiping rebellion (mainland China)
Comparative work on East Indians in the Indian Ocean and Caribbean regions

--New courses planned:
Ideology of women and work
Ethics
Language, law and politics
The Black experience in the Americas
Language and the international order
Anthropology and spatial organization
Political anthropology
Ethnicity and ideology
Anthropology and contemporary human problems
Some health-related courses

—Changes in library resources: More periodicals

--Comments on present procedure for selection of materials:
Dependence on faculty recommendation leads to incomplete holdings
I do not know what the current arrangements are
Steps might be taken to speed up process
Many strengths and weaknesses...bibliographers in conjunction with faculty ordering would be an improvement, as would better means of dealing interdisciplinary needs of the faculty and its programs (like International Studies)

Department: ART (3)

--Average Teaching Support: 7.3
--Average Research Support: 7.0

—New research interests: Concentration on post-war American art
Early Christian
Byzantine

--New courses planned:
Courses taught in French on Medieval art and architecture
American art of the 1950s
Women artists of the 19th and 20th centuries
20th century criticism and art theory
Islamic art

--Changes in library resources: Islamic materials

--Comments on selection: Fortunate to have Mrs. Hassold
Would like more 19th and 20th Catalan history
Lost volumes are not replaced rapidly enough

Department: BOTANY (6)

--Average Teaching Support: 7.9
--Average Research Support: 7.4

--New courses planned: Biology of the Pteridophytes

--Comments on selection:
Problems in persuading library to subscribe to new journals without recommending corresponding deletions in present subscriptions
"Bio. Sci. library is impossibly overcrowded"
Much needed material in storage, stacks are so crowded as to be difficult to use...journals on their spines to save shelf space, with titles hidden
Need more money as we are not able to purchase all the journals, etc. that are necessary
Library staff is overworked and unable to protect books from theft and vandalism
"The administration must place a higher priority on the library"
"My only complaint is that 40+% of the biosci library is in storage - this is disgraceful for nationally ranked Botany and Zoology departments"

Department: CHEMISTRY (11)

--Average Teaching Support: 9.5
--Average Research Support: 8.4

--New research interests:
Membrane and plant bio-organic chemistry
Biochemical aspects of organic synthesis which influence the choice of the target molecules
Surface chemistry and surface analysis techniques
Biological chemistry and molecular biology

--New courses planned:
Bio-organic graduate course
Homogeneous and heterogeneous transition metal catalysis in industrially important reactions
Computers in chemistry
Molecular biochemistry

--Changes in library resources:
More monographs on bio-organic
More journals
More volumes on lab computer basics
More new journals

--Comments on selection:
"Our library appears to be short of funds for acquisitions"
Sometimes we should duplicate books in two or more libraries
Xeroxing service would be useful...use 4 libraries on campus
Chem librarian anticipates all needs
Need more funds for purchasing materials

Department: CLASSICAL STUDIES (6)

--Average Teaching Support: 7.3
--Average Research Support: 6.4

--New research interests: Roman topography
"Going computerized"
Egyptian art

--New courses planned: Problems in classical archaeology
"Re-designing" Roman civilization
Imperial Roman history

--Changes in library resources:
More book and machine-readable text purchases
"More IBM PCs will be needed for students to record data on in the library and then take home where they can 'massage' that data..."

--Comments on selection: Not sure recommendations for purchases are passed on
Don't know how materials are selected
"Most of what I recommend is out of print or unavailable in the USA"
More staff supervision of failure of publisher to supply issues on standing order
Gaps are growing in our serial runs

Department: COMPUTER SCIENCE (4)

--Average Teaching Support: 7.4
--Average Research Support: 6.1

--New courses planned: Expert systems (artificial intelligence)
Discrete mathematics
Advanced VLSI design

--Changes in library resources: New journals in growing areas

--Comments on selection: Paucity of funds
Eric Smith has met our needs
New journals appear and we can't give up old ones in their places
Library rep system is "an artifact"
Difficult to stay ahead of the demand in such a dynamic field
Should check with UNC-CH library, "far superior to ours" --"I usually just go straight there when I need something"

Department: DIVINITY SCHOOL (5)

--Average Teaching Support: 9 0
--Average Research Support: 9.2

--New research interests:
- Late Roman Syria
- Early Christian art and architecture
- Black church
- Theological and psychological implications on parents and children when the parents are terminally ill or suffering incapacitating diseases

--New courses planned:
- Suffering, esp. relation of parents and children and children under stressful situations
- Early Christian culture
- Religion and public education

--Changes in library resources:
- Materials on suffering, theological and psychological aspects; what causes stress (psychological, physical abuse, congenital deficiencies, spontaneous degenerative physiological problems), social causes for depression and anomie

--Comments on selection:
- "A bit more consulatation between the librarian and the faculty about directions of acquisitions policy"
- DMF anticipates requests
- Speed with which (foreign) books are made available in DS library
- "DS library extraordinarily cooperative"

Department: ECONOMICS (6)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.7
--Average Research Support: 8.5

--New research interests:
- Focus on US policy making 1930-60
- Economics of discrimination

--New courses planned:
- Economics of inequality

--Changes in library resources:
- Need bimonthly Reviews of all twelve Federal Reserve banks

--Comments on selection:
- Insufficient numbers of copies, esp. for books used in many courses
- Library "ban" on textbook purchases
- Slowness in filing new books
- Slowness in arranging inter-library lending
- "I regret the frequency of 'lost' materials (which are usually crucial for classwork) and slowness in replacing them"

Department: EDUCATION (2)

--Average Teaching Support: 9.3
--Average Research Support: 8.3

--(No comments)

Department: ENGLISH (12)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.5
--Average Research Support: 7.9

--New research interests:
Perceptual theory and visual media
Wilkie Collins
Film versions of *Romeo and Juliet*
Dramatic writings of the 17th century
Cartoons and illustrations

--New courses planned:
Art and literature
Theory of the novel
The heroic
Mystery and its fictions (Oedipus, Job, Kafka, Robbe-Grillet, Agatha Christie, Poe, et al)
Modern criticism
Images of women in literature
Women writers
Contemporary poetry
Satire
Poe

--Changes in library resources:
Journals
Film-loan arrangement, like interlibrary book loan would be helpful
"Keep building"
Periodicals and newspapers (American), 1865-1910

--Comments on selection:
"A careful study might well be made of ordering for ECL"
"I lament the decreasing ability to engage in retrospective acquisitions..."
"It's a pleasure and a privilege"
"The gaps I discover in the collection of secondary things are seldom hair-raising"
Unlimited undergraduate access to the stacks...items are missing or defaced
"The library should develop means for keeping stricter control over its possessions and should not hesitate to recommend serious punishments for those accused (and guilty) of theft and defacement"
"THE LIBRARY IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT RESOURCE IN THE UNIVERSITY AND WITHOUT IT THE UNIVERSITY DOES NOT EXIST"

Department: FORESTRY AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES (4)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.4
--Average Research Support: 8.4

--New research interests: Decision analysis for water quality management
Pollutant runoff modeling
Ecotoxicology

--New courses planned: Decision and risk analysis
Case studies in toxicology
Environmental physiology

--Changes in library resources: Our current journal coverage is good to excellent, but need more in area of environmental reference books

--Comments on selection: Librarians are very helpful
New form made available to all faculty
Unaware of the nature of present arrangements
Many books dealing with environmental or land economics and policy are not shelved in BF although they are helpful. This is a space problem, and ideally they would all be shelved together.

Department: GERMAN (4)

--Average Teaching Support: 6.1
--Average Research Support: 6.4

--New research interests: East German 20th century author Ulrich Plenzdorf

--New courses planned: "Will be changes shortly"

--Comments on selection: Library staff most cooperative
Classification of titles often "puzzling," e.g., works by an author and those about him are shelved in two separate locations, "almost inaccessible"
Need a more systematic survey of needs (to fill gaps)

Department: HISTORY (17)

--Average Teaching Support: 7.9
--Average Research Support: 7.4

--New research interests: More emphasis on women's history
History of Duke University
Global land use history (esp. S. and SE Asia)
Chemistry in late 18th century Spain
History of Soviet psychiatry

--New courses planned: Changing emphases in courses on 20th centruy Western Europe
History of science and technology
Pre-industrial women's history (medieval, early modern)
Topics in the middle period of Chinese history
Imperial China
Environmental history of South Asia

(HISTORY, cont.)

European civilization from fall of Rome to 1650 (using texts in French)
Film and the history of Latin America
Advanced courses in history of socialism
History of Medieval England
Historical relation between science and technology
Comparative history of mental illness in the modern world
Marx and Freud

--Changes in library resources: More films
"Add new books as they are published"
Landmarks of Science has been very helpful

--Comments on selection: Computer bibliographic search process needs expansion —should be available to students doing research (need for more publicity about it)
Holdings at Medical Library should be duplicated in some cases at PL due to difficulty of doing research at MCL, restrictions on use
"Until the library appoints a genuine Slavic bibliographer we cannot qualify as a research library in this field"
Burgeoning literature on Latin America means that the old method is antiquated. Faculty cannot be responsible for keeping up with it or for filling in gaps. "We desperately need a full-time Latin American bibliographer to go about this work systematically."
"I am a happy customer"
"We badly need more bibliographers who are subject trained and who are sensitive to and informed about faculty and program needs"
Should inform incoming faculty of selection procedure
"I am committed to maintaining the collection in my fields but I never seem to find time to do it systematically"
Emphasis on collection of Western European newspapers and government documents

Department: MATHEMATICS (10)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.7
--Average Research Support: 8.9

--New research interests: Applied mathematics problems in physiology
Continuum mechanics
Math education, esp. educationally disadvantaged students

--New courses planned: Mathematics from a historical perspective
Mathematics of computer graphics

--Changes in library resources: Can rely on Eng'g library in some cases
"Some of the books probably haven't been written yet"
"No more than five books"

--Comments on selection: Frequently find the material I need has been placed at another library - usually appropriately
"Libraries are buying a great deal of junk...I am not saying that anyone is at fault or that selection is easy"

Department: MILITARY SCIENCES (2)

—Average Teaching Support: 9.5
—Average Research Support: 7.5

--New courses planned:
Military justice and the law of war
Military leadership and command management
Increasing emphasis on cartography

--Changes in library resources: Probably minimal

--Comments on selection:
Insufficient microfilm collection of foreign newspapers and news magazines...particularly weak on material from Britain...need minimum of 4 additional papers
More duplicate copies of works on ancient and medieval political theory

Department: MUSIC (3)

--Average Teaching Support: 7.8
--Average Research Support: 3.2

--New research interests: Recently arrived, working on building the collection in major fields (French opera of the late 18th-early 19th centuries, Renaissance performance practice)

--New courses planned:
Humanities and music will be taught in French
Grad. seminar in late 18th century opera
Music in the Indian Ocean area
Franz Schubert

--Comments on selection:
Sam Hammond makes every effort w/in budget to meet requests...still, not enough funds left over
"A major increase in acquisition funds is urgently required"
Reconsider system of basing budget on enrollment (Music books and scores are very expensive)
Journals and books on Southeast Asia needed
Books from OP catalogs needed

Department: PHILOSOPHY (4)

—Average Teaching Support: 9.3
—Average Research Support: 7.5

--New research interests:
Richard Price (continued)
"Justification in moral philosophy"
History of logic
20th century treatments of the conditional in philosophy, linguistics, and logic

--New courses planned: Grad. seminar in Plato

--Comments on selection:
Reference librarians are helpful in getting through rush requests...normal time lag seems longer than necessary
Difficulty in filling the gaps in serial runs...but no reflection on the library staff: sources are just hard to locate

Department: PHYSICS (4)

--Average Teaching Support: 7.3
--Average Research Support: 7.3

--New courses planned: Limitations on physical measurement
Fluid mechanics
Critical phenomena

--Comments on selection: All satisfied

Department: POLITICAL SCIENCE (4)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.3
--Average Research Support: 7.3

--New research interests: Canadian political thought

--New courses planned: American constitutional interpretation
American feminism
The politics of international business and finance

--Changes in library resources: Some impact on 340s and 920s
"Reserves in Undergrad. Lib. (East Campus)"
F & S Predicast International

--Comments on selection: In favor of present rational policy for acquisition of newspapers on microform but opposed to purchase priorities based on space considerations, e.g., NY Herald Tribune
Degree to which Law-Perkins-Divinity should overlap in their collections

Department: PSYCHOLOGY (9)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.3
--Average Research Support: 7.0

--New courses planned: Academically gifted adolescents
Evolution and behavior

--Changes in library resources: "We need a journal collection in Bldg. 9"
"Greater resources needed"

--Comments on selection: "I find the interlibrary loan service invaluable"
"The likelihood of finding something I need is probably not greater than 25%"
Not enough or rapid enough acquisition of biopsychology materials...spend too much on "soft" fringes of psych.
Missing, lost, stolen volumes are not automatically replaced or brought to relevant department's attention to see if they should be immediately replaced
More faculty should be involved in the procedure

Department: RELIGION (4)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.5
--Average Research Support: 7.8

--New research interests: Continue to work in Bengali and Sanskrit (the two languages "cancelled" under PL-480)
Graduate program will be expanded in Hinduism

--New courses planned: 1984: Brave New World?
Ethical Issues in Health and Illness -- US and Great Britain
Graduate courses in Hinduism requiring Bengali and Sanskrit sources
Undergraduate courses requiring anthropological materials on Indian culture and religion (popular Hinduism)

--Changes in library resources: Newly published Sanskrit texts and Bengali texts
Books on Bengali cultural history and religion
Sources for Hindu mythology and Indian art

--Comments on selection: Staff extremely helpful w/ enlarging human rights collection
Certain materials should probably be in Divinity rather than Perkins
No follow through on searches for missing volumes
South Asian librarian should be asked to oversee active acquisitions...he is very accomodating but needs budgetary authorization

Department: ROMANCE LANGUAGES (8)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.0
--Average Research Support: 7.1

--New research interests: More emphasis on Croce's historiography and Marxism
Dante studies and humanism
20th centruy Cuban literature

--New courses planned: Literary semiotics
Computers for the humanities
French science fiction
Contemporary French poetry
Women's issues
Italian cinema
Graduate seminar on modern Cuban literature
Literature of the Hispanic minorities in the US
The American imagination

ROMANCE LANGUAGES, cont.

—Changes in library resources:
More in contemporary French poetry, Semiotics, science fiction
Contemporary French writing and periodicals
Political philosophy, anthropology, maybe history in the French language
Sources for Italian cinema (reviews, tapes, cassettes, books on directors, etc.)
As grad. program in literature (Ph.D.) grows, will need books and journals in methodologies and comparative studies (Italian)
More in Cuban-Caribbean literature
Much more in literature of US Hispanic minorities

--Comments on selection:
Leyte-Vidal always extremely cooperative
Ordering of books should not be left up to faculty since it results in uneven and idiosyncratic acquisitions patterns
Perkins needs a full-time bibliographer for Hispanic collection
Library gives extraordinary service
Have more resources than our teaching program demands at present...must make more and better use of the library
"Is there someone in the Collections Dpt. who specializes in the foreign language/literature area? ....faculty ordering is hit or miss"

Department: SOCIOLOGY (4)

—Average Teaching Support: 7.5
—Average Research Support: 7.5

—New research interests: Comparative health care organizations (Canada, UK, Sweden, Switzerland)

—New courses planned:
Social networks
Analysis of military manpower in the US

—Changes in library resources: "The problem is that the collections aren't kept up"

—Comments on selection:
Until there is enough money the method of choice doesn't matter
Divided catalog "a bit awkward"

Department: ZOOLOGY (11)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.1
--Average Research Support: 7.5

--New research interests: Sedimentology

--New courses planned: Microcomputer use in biological research
Physical radiations and biological effects
Sediment sampling technology

--Changes in library resources: Current textbook holdings are out-of-date for microcomputers. Journal subscriptions are up-to-date

"I expect to depend heavily on UNC and NCSU holdings (sedimentology)

--Comments on selection: Library handicapped by inadequate budgets..I am reluctant to recommend purchases of things we need

Library wastes money on "curating out of date textbooks" and on subscribing to trade journals, duplicating subscriptions between branches..."the blame for these faults I attribute to selfish, narrow minded and lazy colleagues -- Perkins can't do much to help!"

"This questionnaire is a waste of your time and money"

BF library is steadily becoming less useful for research and teaching...relevant holdings are inconveniently arranged...I rely more and more on Mudd (where Arts and Sciences has no actual claim?) and on Chemistry.

"The library as a whole is in deterioration for biophysical subjects vis a vis Arts and Sciences"

Problem of space in BF library, so much material tucked away in storage and not accessible..."even though the staff is always prompt in retrieving materials, I often have to stop what I am doing for the day until I get the information I need. This is very discouraging."

Department: BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING (3)

--Average Teaching Support: 5.0
--Average Research Support: 6.0

--New research interests: Reactor design and separation techniques for biochemical synthesis

--New courses planned:
Biochemical engineering
Microcomputer systems for real time data acquisition and display
Advanced topics in electrophysiology

--Changes in library resources: Up-to-date holdings in the changing field of microcomputing

--Comments on selection:
New and haven't been informed about procedure
Would like to use my terminal to access card catalog, OCLC
Not enough money
"A unified science library would be ideal for my work..."
We are falling behind on the use of computers to retrieve and search for material...must give the library staff opportunity for growth and guidelines for the future (in area of more extensive use of computers)...pilot programs for a few disciplines?

Department: CIVIL ENGINEERING (3)

--Average Teaching Support: 7.5
--Average Research Support: 6.0

--New research interests:
Parallel processing
Aerospace structures
Composite materials

--New courses planned:
Nonlinear mechanics
Computer graphics (biased toward analytic geometry)
Load and resistance based structural design

--Comments on selection:
Eric Smith entirely satisfactory
Response time for cataloging and acquisition slow at times
Standard request form might be useful
"You all should have a computerized check-out system"

Department: MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (4)

--Average Teaching Support: 9.0
--Average Research Support: 8.0

--New research interests:
Robotics, automated manufacturing
Safe-product design

--New courses planned:
Technological forecasting
Electrohydrodynamics
Low density flow
Safe-product design
Risk analysis and assessment

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING, cont.

--Changes in library resources: Complete sets of ANSI and UL standards
GSA and MIL specs (but can't justify cost)

--Comments on selection: Need more resources, including furniture (shelves) for new building
E. Smith very receptive and helpful

Department: MISCELLANEOUS* (12)

--Average Teaching Support: 8.4
--Average Research Support: 7.2

--New research interests: Jewish-American literature
Contemporary female novelists
Shift from purely Slavic to Comparative Slavic/Finno-Ugric Linguistics
Stress and stress management
Clinical child, peer relationships, social development
Increasingly interdisciplinary (no dept. given)

--New courses planned: History of the Russian language
Conversational Russian
Robotics
Applications and programming of robotics
The novel of the self, east and west

--Changes in library resources: Additional holdings of translated novels
More materials on lesser-known Slavic languages (dictionaries: Macedonian, Slovenian, Lusatian)

--Comments on selection: Library needs to actively pursue the use of individual computers -- to obtain information from our libraries
"Without the reference department at Perkins we would be out of business!"
Is there a way to know whether a book one needs is part of the cataloging backlog? Acquisition in some areas seems to be interrupted and/or cancelled...I love Duke library!
"I suspect most of my colleagues could not pass an oral exam on exactly how the selection process occurs"
Difficulty with separation of author's works from critical works about him/her -- shelves not contiguous
Easy access to ordered materials could help
Present arrangement is "absolutely unsatisfactory...the addition of an Asian language bibliographer (with concentration in Japanese) is ESSENTIAL"
"Our librarians are doing 'good job'"

*Includes: one HPER, two aerospace engineering, one EE, one placement services, one Slavic, one PPS, one continuing education, one international studies, three unknown name/department.